THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

In *The Hibbert Journal* for April Mr. Terence G. White has an article on the saying of Jesus in Mk 12^{17}, 'Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's.' Few texts, he says, are more famous; few have been deemed easier of interpretation; yet few present in fact such rich and bewildering difficulties. It is therefore not unexpected when we find that the article consists largely of questions. The questions are mostly good, and one is sometimes reminded of T. R. Glover's words: 'Is not a question a kind of education?' But sometimes, on the other hand, we recall the Spanish proverb: 'The man who asked a question on Friday was buried on Saturday.'

The first question obviously is: Who is Cæsar? He may be an imperialist dictator, like Hitler. And in that case were the Resistance Movements to blame? Also, were the 'good Germans' who in their secret souls were anti-Nazi justified in carrying out Hitler's ferocious orders? 'Render unto Cæsar'—he *was* Cæsar and no good would come of resisting. The Jew of our Lord's day actively and deeply resented the Roman power. But Jesus says to him: give to the established authority, evil as it is, the tribute which his laws exact. The Roman power was in many ways, though by no means all, as oppressive as Nazi authorities. Can we, in view of the dictum of Jesus, say that those who obeyed were wrong?

Of course, this raises another issue: Which is the legitimate authority and which not? The Roman power was in Palestine by right of conquest. Britain is in India ultimately by the same right. The Soviet rulers are in Russia very much by the same right. A Communist was heard not long ago to say that every country was governed by a minority, and if that minority had the force and initiative to seize power, its position was justified. There is no doubt that Nazism represented a minority of the German people. Does its conquest make it (and Britain in India, and Salazar in Portugal, and Franco in Spain) legitimate?

These questions are not meant to suggest that the position of Britain in India and that of Hitler in Germany are on the same level of worth. Britain in India has been on the whole beneficent and has pursued a high, and largely altruistic, ideal. That, however, is not the point. Britain has been Cæsar in India through her past conquests, though she has conferred untold blessings on India. Does this constitute a *right* to be there? Does this make her position legitimate and bring her into the sphere of our Lord's law?

How exacting Cæsar may be and how intolerant of conviction may be seen in the case of France. The order of Trappists there have to break their vow of perpetual silence to serve a term of military conscription, not as chaplains but in the ranks. That this has aroused little official opposition from the Church of Rome is probably due to the view that on the whole this may benefit the Church (as it undoubtedly has done). But the point is that no vocation, no vow or sacrament, has any rights in comparison with the State's military demands. No altar is immune from loyalty to Cæsar.

Mr. White adduces as another instance of the same thing the stringent order against fraternizing of Allied troops with German civilians. It was forbidden to enter a German church, which often—say for a Romanist soldier in a Protestant unit—meant absence from all religious services. It forbade association with German Jews for whom we were fighting. And Mr White asks whether this order was calculated to impress the Germans that we are Christian conquerors?

In trying to apply our Lord's words we are bound to consider what the actual sphere of God's authority is: 'Render unto God *the things that are God's*.' What things? You may say 'everything.' God's presence is everywhere; His rule embraces every sphere of man's life. Just as we believe that His Spirit is omnipresent, inspiring, creating, moulding, the secret of all good and truth, so we must believe that there is nothing that does not come under His sovereignty. But this is rather like an evasion. Jesus had in His mind a distinction, 'the things that are Cæsar's,

the things that are God's,' and, though you may argue that tribute to Cæsar is tribute to God, yet in the first instance it is Cæsar's sphere. What is God's ?

The question is relevant to many things. In particular it is relevant to the Church's attitude to social evils, such as bad housing, extreme poverty, exaggerations of wealth and want, the whole structure of society. Is this God's sphere or Cæsar's ? Is the Church intrusive when it boldly enters this region and advocates social reforms ? Or ought it to confine itself to 'spiritual' matters ? There are good people who hold that the very meaning of the text we are considering is that Christians should leave Cæsar to manage his own business and confine themselves to preaching the 'gospel.' We have nothing to do with the sphere of social reform, because we are committed to a ministry in what are obviously 'the things of God.'

It is just as clear to others that 'the things of God' include everything that hinders the good life, and many things do this which are not obviously 'spiritual.' If God's will is that all men should have the opportunity of a full and rich life (as it is), then everything that prevents that is the concern of the Church and everything that will help towards the enjoyment of the best life is the concern of the Church. The things that make brotherhood a reality, the things that make happiness possible for all, and peace of mind, and knowledge, and leisure to 'make' the soul, these are 'the things of God.'

After all it is not so difficult to answer these fundamental questions as Mr. WHITE suggests. But if we are to obey the Lord's word it is necessary to answer them. What is a legitimate authority ? What is the sphere of God's will ? What is the relation of 'the things of Cæsar' and 'the things of God ?' Is it imperative that the Church should enter the political sphere when moral issues are concerned ? Many faithful men have answered these questions definitely to the peace of their souls, and will go on answering them even in wars that menace all our values.

The question of authority in religion presents itself in one guise or another to every age. Recent theological activity, especially on the Protestant front, has given the question a fresh prominence. This lends a timely interest to a study in the teaching of Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin just published by the Rev. Rupert E. DAVIES, M.A., B.D., under the title *The Problem of Authority in the Continental Reformers.*[1]

To what extent did the Reformers recognize the problem of authority ? What answer did they give ? Will their answer still hold for us ? With this schema of questions as his method of inquiry Mr. DAVIES expounds in much fullness the distinctive positions of the Reformers. The result is a very readable and informative book. We think that, especially on the expository side, it will prove of great value to students. The exposition seeks to be faithful to the historical evidence, and is well documented. Though the study is severely historical the material presented is also scanned with an attentive criticism.

What was common to all the Reformers was that they envisaged the problem of authority in terms of the supremacy of Scripture. They did this without at first conceiving their views as an attack upon the Roman Church. But as the sense of this opposition was realized by them, they were constrained to define and defend more clearly this Biblical insistence. Mr. DAVIES brings out very clearly how this led to considerable differences of emphasis and interpretation. He finds, however, a common limitation and defect in their teaching, inasmuch as they tended to hold it as self-evident that the Scriptures were supreme, and needed no supporting argument. Despite many masterly passages in his 'Institutes' not even Calvin escaped this, though his sense of the issue was deeper than that of Luther or Zwingli.

Out of the wide area and crowded material with which this volume is concerned we select for a summary statement some of the findings presented in the chapter on Luther. It was on the basis of his profound religious experience that Luther exalted the Bible. But as closer study showed it did not at all points tally with that experience. Luther advances to the idea of the 'Bible within the Bible.' Of the Old Testament he is content to say it is the Word of God spoken to the natural conscience of humanity. In the case of the New Testament the test of what is Word of God is, Does it preach Christ ? On this ground Sabatier claimed that Luther 'removed the seat of authority from the Church to the Christian consciousness.' Mr. DAVIES agrees this was the tendency in Luther's teaching, but not his purpose. The Word, as religiously defined, still remains for him the external infallible authority. But even so, the 'personal' element cannot be avoided. For as Mr. DAVIES contends, 'If we use as a principle of valuation, Does this preach Christ or not, we are

[1] Epworth Press ; 12s. 6d. net.

assuming that we know what a book says when it does preach Christ.' Luther's search for objectivity has led him to impose upon Scripture a unity which is too narrow and too undifferentiated.

When we ask concerning the relations of the Word, as propounded by Luther, to the Church and the State the uncertainties and inconsistencies in the position come more fully to light. Mr. DAVIES has to confess the unsystematic character of Luther's thought. The Word is over and above the Church, and the Church as a creation by the Word is but the instrument the Word uses. But the obscurities in Scripture, which Luther is compelled to admit, require also an interpreting Church. The fear of conceding much to the Church other than proclamation is understandable in the setting of that age. But part of the reason for the inadequate doctrine of the Church lay in the failure to assess Scripture as a historic record involving therefore, in spite of its real unity, the realities of different level and valuations. For the State also the Word of God is supreme. But the State was not, like the Church, created by the Word. The State for Luther is divinely ordained; it was created by the act of God to deal with the situation created by sin. Nevertheless the State as set up and functioning must draw its legislative activities from the prescriptions and regulations of the Word. How this follows, Luther does not make very clear. At this point Luther and Calvin diverge. Calvin does not free the State from Divine sanction but he does not subordinate it to the Church or Scripture. One consequence however of Luther's view is that submission to the State becomes 'the principal if not in fact almost the only duty of the subject.' This with all its dangerous possibilities follows from what Mr. DAVIES calls Luther's totalitarian concept of the Word of God.

To the more systematic mind of Calvin Mr. DAVIES turns with expectation. Nevertheless many of the difficulties encountered earlier appear again. Calvin appears to commit himself to a completely verbal and mechanical theory of inspiration. On the other hand when the question is put, How is the Bible attested as the Word of God? we get the answer that the Spirit inwardly gives us a hidden testimony. But it is difficult to evade the criticism of Seeberg that these ideas of Scripture remain disparate and unrelated in Calvin's thought. Mr. DAVIES' full chapter upon Calvin's position we must leave for the reader's own exploration, but extract from it one finding: 'This "internal element" is the most fruitful of all Calvin's ideas on the question of authority. Few people nowadays are internally convinced that the whole Bible is the Word of God and therefore the idea in the narrow form in which Calvin enunciated it must be discounted. But if we liberate it from the limits he imposed on it, and say that the source of authority in general is the coerciveness of truth and the inner testimony of the Holy Spirit working together, we have a view which is worthy of very serious consideration.'

Towards the Conversion of England.

The Church and Evangelism.

BY THE REVEREND CANON ROGER LLOYD, M.A., WINCHESTER.

IT seems to have escaped most people's notice that the Report prepared by the Archbishop's Commission on Evangelism, and entitled *Towards the Conversion of England*, has a sub-title which is printed on the cover, and which reads: 'A Plan Dedicated to the Memory of Archbishop William Temple.' In truth, this sub-title is misleading, for anything like a plan to accomplish so mighty a project is not to be found in the pages of the Report, and indeed it does not exist anywhere except in the mind of God. How could there be a plan when nobody could say with scientific precision what such a phrase as 'The Conversion of England' really means? The plain fact is that anything like a concerted effort or drive for the conversion of England, planned by some headquarters staff and carried out on a Church-wide scale after the manner of the National Mission of Repentance and Hope, is now quite out of the question. This ought not to disconcert us. It is only another way of saying that the energy which creates the Kingdom of God is not our energy, and of admitting that God, whose action is as unpredictable as it is invariable, flatly declines to be organized by even His best-intentioned children. After all, the period of Christian history which

most fully speaks to our condition to-day is Pentecost. From that Upper Room eleven men set out to convert the Roman Empire, and they had no shadow of a plan to accomplish it. All they knew was the next step—to announce in the Temple Courts and the Market Places that Jesus was risen ; and, as every reader of Harnack knows, the Gospel they preached made its way to triumph in ways which could never have been foreseen or planned, for the chief way of all was the being rather than the doing of Christians. What they did was to present God with a human situation upon which He could release torrential and irresistible streams of spiritual power.

There is, however, another reason why a concerted evangelistic drive to convert England, after the manner of a nation-wide campaign, is out of the question. The Report of the Commission hints at this reason when it mournfully asks, ' Can we point to fellowship as the characteristic mark of the Christian Church to-day ? Few would dare to do so, as far as the Church in this land is concerned.' Not long ago the clergy of a certain town met together to spend a day in prayer and discussion to discover what God's will for them in this matter of evangelism might be. One after another, as each spoke his mind in turn, they found themselves discussing the lack of fellowship among them. It was as though they were led to say, ' Before anything else can be done we must find the right basis for satisfactory spiritual fellowship among ourselves ; and until we have done so it is quite idle to discuss the ways and means of a united evangelistic campaign.' *Mutatis mutandis*, exactly the same thing is true of all our congregations, as also of the relationship between clergy and laity. Within the limited experience of the present writer, there are scores of other instances of an exactly similar recognition that spiritual fellowship at a deep level is the *sine qua non* of any church which aspires to realize its true destiny as a part of the Body of Christ. Where this does not exist, nothing whatever can be fruitfully done until it has been made to exist.

If we may accept the idea of the conversion of England as an ultimate aim (though many would challenge this as being too insular) then we have in the need of deepening fellowship in the Church our next step, our ' priority number one.' The fact that we cannot at present see what kind of step we should have to take after that need not worry us. In the building of the Kingdom of God in willed obedience to the guiding of the Holy Spirit, it is constantly true that every successive step has to be groped for, and only very rarely is more than one step at a time shown to us.

This prior need to find the way of Christian fellowship has clear Biblical sanctions. ' Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them,' said Jesus ; and this He instanced in His own practice by choosing twelve men to be constantly with Him, dealing, of course, with each one of them separately as the particular need of Matthew or Peter might require, but training them to be a team, so that, in the fullness of time, the Holy Spirit might come upon their togetherness. And this, so the Bible asserts on page after page, is the context upon which the Spirit does most fully come. Inspiration comes upon communities first, and upon individuals in and through their membership of inspired communities. It is as we pay heed to the Common Life of the Body of Christ that we qualify to receive His grace, and the strength that comes to us when we are together is greater by far than the sum of our separate strengths in isolation. The first evangelistic prayer of the Church ought to be, ' Help us to be *one* that others may be *won*.'

This insight history completely endorses. It is a matter of demonstrable fact that the strength and the beauty of the fellowship which bound the earliest Christians together was the most influential of all their weapons of conversion. Indeed, it could very easily be shown that throughout history the Church has been evangelistically strong exactly when its members had a vivid sense of their corporateness, and weak when it was given over to individualism, when it relied too completely on the exceptional brilliance of a few highly gifted leaders. The Church conquers the world not by leadership so much as by the cumulative pressure upon unredeemed society of an anonymous host of obscure Christians who have no gifts but the gifts of faithfulness to Christ and fellowship with each other, because all alike are His. Great leadership is, of course, necessary, but it is not ultimately decisive. The quality of Christian fellowship is the really peerless thing.

Such is the Biblical view ; and the Bible, whatever view we take of the ways and means of its inspiration, is the Word of God ; and for all evangelism in the twentieth century no less than in the first its universal principles are decisive. Our modern experience of the ways of conversion endorses it too. The first stages in the conversion of some particular soul are nearly always the commerce of that soul with some one other, whom it has learned from experience first to like and then to trust. We can convert nobody whom we do not like, and nobody whose trust we have not earned. But then it is also a very rare thing that any of us, in our own separate person, is able to carry a friend through every one of the stages and processes of his conversion. We may start him on the road ; we may even be allowed to take him quite a long way of his momentous journey.

But almost always the day comes when we ourselves can do no more and go no further. What is then required, over and over again, is some appropriate Christian fellowship into which our friend can be drafted—a fellowship which will truly and gladly welcome him, and make him free of itself as a most honoured member. Such a training in corporate discipleship is at some stage his next step ; and as things are it only too often happens that the appropriate fellowship simply is not there. The same necessity is disclosed as soon as one reflects for a moment on the strangely large number of people who seem to be required to lead a single soul through life and bring that soul to God at last. Each one of us does indeed give only a ' passing touch ' to a soul in the making, and unless we are in fellowship one with another we shall hardly escape that deadly heresy of love, which is possessiveness, the refusal to let go one's hold over another and hand him on to the next ward in the Lord, and which wrecks every possibility of full conversion, and every prospect of evangelism.

' For their sakes I sanctify myself,' wrote St. Paul ; and although it may seem at first a contradiction in terms to think first of the Church's interior life when one is discussing the question of the Church and Evangelism, the contradiction (if it is one) has this apostolic sanction. To use the jargon of the moment, the Church attending to its own standards of fellowship is an ' introvert ' action, whereas the Church telling it out among the heathen that the Lord is king is an ' extravert ' action. Since the one can be so plainly shown to be inescapably necessary to the other, and because the right standards of fellowship in the Church do constitute a *Preparatio Evangelica*, there is perhaps no contradiction. But very certainly there is tension between the two. And so there should be, since without tension there can be neither growth nor creativeness.

The relationship between the two ideas of the Kingdom of Heaven in our Lord's teaching ought to help us at this point, for though there is a necessary relationship between the ideas there is a no less necessary tension. ' The Kingdom of Heaven is within you,' a precious and a personal possession, an individual state of mind. It is an offer to each one of us, with all its joy, peace, and serenity, here and now, at once, and on the spot ; for the miseries of this sinful world are powerless to hurt the Kingdom which is within us. But there is also the external kingdom, the social and political shape of the world as it will be when at last God's will is perfectly done in it ; and this Kingdom waits until the last slum cottage has been destroyed, the last war fought, the last act of national or social rebellion against God repented, shriven, and forgiven. Into the one kingdom we can enter to-morrow, even while we are still the citizens of that other amorphous chaos which, to all human seeming, is centuries away from becoming any kind of Kingdom of our Lord. But—and here is the double tension—no one can be made free of the first kingdom who forgets his duty of serving his Master in the second, and no one can be truly loving his neighbour in the second kingdom unless he is treasuring the first, is striving to enter it and to make his own its peace and its joy.

There is therefore ample scriptural warrant for claiming that a Church which looks first to its own beauty, tries to build up within itself the Common Life of the Body of Christ, and struggles to wipe away from its face each spot and wrinkle is a Church all the time qualifying to be a profoundly and radically evangelistic Church. Further than that, no Church which is failing to struggle to be and to do these things has any chance of being evangelistic in any effective way. For all these reasons there is no disproportion of emphasis in giving to the beauty of Christian fellowship pride of place in any discussion about the evangelistic duty of the Church. The contrary proposition is so patently true that it needs no argument to justify it : a Church which is not evangelistically minded will never find the way to fellowship within itself. Evangelism is for the Church its whole life—an attitude both towards God and the world which informs and colours every single thing that it does, from the celebration of a sacrament to the parish dance and the babies' Sunday-school class.

Yet fellowship is not only a means but also an end—an absolute good in its own right and for its own sake ; since it is that upon which the power of God can come, the social quality of persons which most fully reflects the divine energy. It is precisely because true fellowship has this power, because a Church at unity in itself is one which causes the devil to fly shrieking away, that the common, insidious perversions of fellowship are so deadly. Every good and perfect gift is always dogged by some misbegotten shadow of itself, some perversion of its own excellence which gets itself mistaken for the real thing. Thus the perversions of love are both lust and the sense of exclusive possessiveness. Fellowship also has its perversions. They are, first, the ' mateyness ' which is fellowship without any roots, and, second, that revelling in its own intrinsic pleasantness which causes it to become self-regarding, and to try to live with its eyes always turned inwards upon itself.

The creation of fellowship in the Church can never be wholly spontaneous. If the perversions

are to be avoided, they must be deliberately guarded against; and the whole enterprise becomes one over which real pains must be taken and to which real thought must be given. The first perversion, that of mistaking an easy 'mateyness' for a deep fellowship, is not difficult to guard against when it has once been recognized. A body of people who are held together not so much by like-mindedness as by the voluntary acceptance of a corporately imposed and corporately obeyed rule of life will become a true fellowship of the spirit, with roots sunk deep. The common discipline is in fact the vital cement of fellowship; and not the least of the reasons why some of the great Churches are not famous for the warmth of their fellowship is that most of their members simply do not know what are the rules of their Church, and would probably not accept them as binding upon them if they did know. The sad thing is that any Church of which this is a roughly accurate description is one which cannot act as a unity in the work of Christian evangelism. To be members one of another it is first of all necessary to be obeying some disciplines together.

The second perversion of Christian fellowship in the Church is less easy to overcome. If a particular fellowship is to qualify to be used by God its interior standards of devotion and of mutual friendship must be high, and the higher they are the more there is bound to be, as, indeed, there must be, a certain separation between itself and the world outside. Everybody who has enjoyed practical experience of the working of Christian cells knows very well that their great danger is that the minds of their members can so easily be turned inwards upon the cultivation of the corporate life of Christian devotion which together they are building. This is all the more difficult because they must indeed pay great heed to this very thing, and because there is a sense in which they must be a little exclusive if they are to build anything at all. When one is struggling to create Christian community out of very small numbers, the inclusion of a single passenger is fatal, and to admit one new member with whom any of the others are temperamentally in discord is also fatal. These necessities create a danger, as the Commission's Report faithfully stresses in these words:

> 'There arises the need of inner groups within the wider fellowship of the Church. Undoubtedly the creation of inner groups is a policy fraught with difficulty and even with danger. The members of such groups sometimes become eclectic in their attitude to the general congregation, while those without are inclined to be suspicious and resentful of those within. With all groups, too, there is the distasteful necessity both of keeping out, and of weeding out, unsuitable members.'

But, in spite of this, the Report says:

> 'But whatever the difficulty or danger, these must be faced and risked, for we believe that without such inner groups the work of present day evangelism cannot go forward. . . . The cell or group method is, perhaps, the most effective instrument for evangelism under present conditions.'

It is so precisely because of the high standard of fellowship which such a way of discipleship invariably provides for all who are prepared to pay the price of it.

Once this perversion is forced into the open and squarely faced it is not difficult to find the remedy. Granted that the idea of the evangelistic fellowship of Christian believers in the widest sense is the ideal to aim at, it follows that the idea has to be locally epitomized. If the basic unit for our own day is the cell or small group, then it is necessary to see that every such group is conscious of its membership of something wider than itself. This larger unit may be a series of such groups, or it may be—as, in a sense, it must always be—a worshipping congregation. It is an absolute principle that every small group must be kept constantly in touch with others. *Mutatis mutandis*, exactly the same thing is true of whole congregations which are seeking for a higher standard of fellowship. The more fully they achieve it, the more must they be held to the wider loyalties of the rural deanery, the diocese, and the whole Church. In just the same way, a fellowship which is genuinely Christian will always be reaching outwards to the secular world. If it is seeking to build itself into one organ of the Body of Christ, and to reproduce within itself the common life of that Body, it will never succeed in this unless and until, in one and the same motion, it is separating itself from that world in the sense of living corporately by far higher standards, and also reaching outwards to that world. Its own interior life of fellowship can never satiate its corporate yearning for souls, but it will not in fact yearn at all if its own life is of a low standard.

Literature.

A NEW REVISED VERSION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

When the Revised Version of the New Testament appeared in 1881 two million copies were sold before publication; and the new renderings of the Gospels and of the Acts and of the Epistle to the Romans were cabled *in extenso* to the Chicago Times, which printed them in full. There is no likelihood of *The Revised Standard Version of the New Testament*, that is the Revision of the American Version of 1901, creating any such stir and excitement, partly because we have grown accustomed these days to retranslations of the Scriptures. Yet the claim on the cover, 'the most important publication of 1946' is difficult to challenge. A few weeks ago there appeared what might have been a rival in Ronald Knox's 'The New Testament, newly translated into English,' which, as one would expect, is a living bit of work, distinguished by both scholarship and a sense of style. But, apparently commissioned by the Roman Catholic authorities in England, he was set to work, not on the Greek texts, but on the Vulgate, and gives one the impression of a creature straitly cabined in a pen, restive at times, but on the whole meekly accepting the dictum of an infallible Church, which, in this matter at least, every scholar knows to be grotesque.

This most recent translation is an excellent one; as was to be expected with Dr. Weigle of Yale as the Chairman of the Committee, and our own James Moffatt as its Secretary. The result of their long labours is a credit to all concerned.

To begin with, one must emphasize the quite extraordinarily fine work which Nelson & Sons have put into the printing and the general set up of the book. Here, at last, the Testament is given its chance; appears without the horrible handicaps that have burdened it so long—the drab binding, the crowded pages, the double columns, the trying type, all that is gone. And we are offered, alluringly bound in a pleasing blue, a volume light and easy to handle, yet printed in a type delightfully and beautifully clear, and priced at $2.00.

The Committee has issued a pamphlet of some seventy pages, consisting of short essays in which certain of their number lay down what they had in mind, and how they sought to work it out. Thus, countering the objection still felt by many against any change in the glorious language of the 1611 Bible, they point out that it itself was the revision of a revision of a revision; that it was not the first, but the third, to be 'authorized' to be read in churches; and that, for fifty years after its appearance, it had to fight its way into favour against much hot objection to it, being roundly charged with being 'bad theology, bad scholarship, and bad English'! It is admitted that the revision of 1881 was, at most, only partially successful, being almost woodenly literal. As an indignant reviewer of those days put it, 'The revisers were not appointed to prepare an interlinear translation for incompetent schoolboys.' Yet it was felt that the man in the street was losing touch with the Scripture, partly because it seemed to him to belong to an archaic world in which he was not at home; and to speak in a language that was not native to him. That idea has been worked hard. True, certain expressions have grown unfamiliar, and some words have changed their meaning. Sometimes in the Authorized Version prevent means, not prevent, but precede; and conversation, not talk, but conduct. And occasionally the sense of a passage is obscured. 'Abstain from every appearance of evil' is far better rendered 'every form of evil.' 'If one died for all, then were all dead' so run the familiar words. But really there is nothing hypothetical about it, but the most emphatic of assertions. 'We are convinced that one has died for all; therefore all have died.'

A more urgent need for a revision arises from the discoveries, some of them in quite recent years, of ancient manuscripts which by truth-loving people cannot be ignored; and still more by the coming to light of that mass of papyri, documents of all kinds, which have rediscovered for us the *Koinē*, that type of Greek once spoken over a greater portion of the civilized world than English is now, and in which the New Testament was written. Issued originally in the language of the people, so the argument runs, it should be translated into that. And so the revisers set themselves to the task of finding a way between the loveliness of the Authorized Version, found now to be in places obscure and inaccurate, and the mechanical transliterating of our Revised Version, and the colloquial renderings of the present day; seeking to retain the merits of each of them, yet to drop their faults. As I judge, most commendably they have succeeded. There are, indeed, few of the delightful surprises that leapt at us from some modern translations, when some happy turn of phrase made what had been opaque to us dazzlingly luminous; and meanings, hidden from us by words grown too familiar, rushed suddenly out of the flatness of the page, vivid, dramatic, exciting, evidently there.

'Our mouth is open to you, Corinthians, our heart is wide. You are not restricted by us, but you are restricted in your own affections. In return—I speak as to children—widen your hearts also,' as the new translation runs, seems to me tame indeed, compared to Moffatt's, 'O Corinthians I am keeping nothing back from you; my heart is wide open to you. "Restraint?"—that lies with you, not me. A fair exchange now, as the children say! Open your hearts wide to me.' Or how prosaic is, 'He is not weak in dealing with you, but is powerful in you,' beside his, 'It is no weak Christ you have to do with, but a Christ of

power.' 'So that you may approve what is excellent' does not grip me like, 'enabling you to have a sense of what is vital.' Neither does, 'In humility count others better than yourselves,' match, 'humbly considering each other the better man.' How Weymouth's splendid, 'Yet, to each of us individually, grace was given, weighed out with the munificence of Christ,' outruns the tame drabness of, 'But grace was given to each of us according to the measure of Christ's gift.'

But there are here no occasional slips such as jar at times in certain of the present-day translations. Everywhere there is seemliness, reverence, dignity, even a quiet beauty. Though, indeed, they keep telling us that the Testament is not, primarily, a piece of literature, but the Word of the Lord God Almighty, sent forth to save men's souls. The Word of God, said Luther, has feet, and runs after a man; and hands that grip him. And the ideal these men have kept steadily before them is that through their efforts these feet may become swifter, and these hands more arresting; that God's Word may break through to our generation. And I think it will.

A. J. GOSSIP.

THE THEOLOGY OF SCRIPTURE.

'It is the main contention of this book that during the period immediately behind us there has been serious neglect of fruitful study of the meaning of the churchly use of the Bible and of the theological use of the Bible, in part owing to the intensity of the effort that has been devoted to the study of the academic and historical uses of the Bible. What is necessary is a redressing of the balance, without lessening any of the work which is devoted to academic and historical treatment of the Bible.' This is the thesis put forward by Professor Hubert Cunliffe-Jones in a recent book, *The Authority of the Biblical Revelation* (James Clarke; 7s. 6d. net). The book is able, earnest and deserving of much attention, though it is written in a style which will not be easy for the reader.

We cannot return now to the older understanding of Revelation. To do that would be to repudiate the gains of two centuries of critical historical labours. Yet the critical, analytic work on Scripture has left a gap. Exegesis and interpretation must come into closer alliance and move forward to exposition which will do justice to the unity of Scripture in its Godward reference, and to its eternal contemporaneous meaning. ('What does God say through Amos *as a witness to the Christian faith*?') This positive constructive dealing with the Divine Word in the witness of Scripture, to bring the Bible back into the heart of doctrine and of the devotional life, sets the direction for Christian scholarship in our time. Professor Cunliffe-Jones reminds us that his book is not the provision of this interpretation. It is rather a preliminary encounter with some of the elements that pertain vitally to this quest. But he ranges over a wide field, and among many interesting chapters we wish to emphasize the two dealing with the interrelations of the two Testaments. His view is that we must accept in all seriousness the principle of the New Testament interpretation of the Old, for Jesus Christ is 'Israel concentrated in Himself and freed from imperfection.' The most critical reader will agree that Professor Cunliffe-Jones has here raised the crucial point for theological study. What should be our use and understanding of the Old Testament as a Christian's book?

In his Preface Professor Cunliffe-Jones says he hopes to add his quota to the kind of Biblical evaluation he feels needful in our time by offering in due course an expository commentary on Deuteronomy. We should hope that much that is general and tentative in this book under review would be thereby illustrated and clarified. What can be said now is that for the main intent of this book there can be hearty commendation. It is an appeal to apply, with a new concern, to Scripture the text 'this treasure we have in earthen vessels that the excellency of the power may be of God and not of us,' and so to speak of the treasure that it can be 'understanded' of the people. For the Bible is a literature of faith; it is given to the Church to be faith creating and faith sustaining. And there is yet more truth to break out from it.

It is possible that in the urgency to say this we may err in two ways. We may regard too negatively the past labours of critical scholarship and think we have to replace that effort by some new technique. This would be unjust, for theological intent and principle are deeply present in much of that critical service of the past. Also in our return to Biblical theology the concept of a unity which belongs to Scripture must not be strained. As Revelation took upon it the forms and actuality of history so Revelation itself forbids us a too hasty 'Christianising' of its record. This kind of unity may land us in arbitrary exegesis. In his presentation of his thesis Professor Cunliffe-Jones is not free from this twofold disbalance. We think his final report out of proportion when he concludes that the Church is 'quite uncertain what the Word of God is, and we have only vaguely more certain standards and hope than the decent citizen of the world.'

But to linger on these criticisms would be unjust to the wealth of suggestion and counsel in this earnest and scholarly book. The Bible, he says, 'is an odd, difficult and perplexing book; not at all what we would have invented.' His plea is that critical scholarship and theological affirmation should interpenetrate one another to show men afresh its greatness, its right to command and enlighten us in ultimate things. This book will render much service, and we hope it will be widely read.

J. MACLEOD.

A NEW VENTURE.

The Evangelical party in the Church of England has launched a new enterprise of considerable interest and importance. Some of its leaders are conscious that it has not been conspicuously articulate, and that the evangelical interpretation

of Christian theology has been voiced mainly by Free Church writers like P. T. Forsyth, who enjoys a definite popularity in Anglican circles. There has, however, in recent times been a decided trend towards the evangelical emphasis, and it is of moment that this should be given considered expression in theological discussions. It has been exploited by reactionary forces on the one hand and by Barthian mistrust of all human endeavour on the other. But an enlightened evangelicalism, which preserves a right proportion between traditionalism and liberalism, has at present an excellent chance of being heard.

Such an evangelical standpoint, which has moved away from the narrowness of the older evangelical party, and is prepared to combine loyalty to the apostolic faith with an open mind on scientific and critical conclusion, it is now proposed to express in a series of theological works, three of which have just appeared. They are *The Book of Common Prayer*, by the Rev. D. E. W. Harrison, M.A., Archdeacon of Sheffield; *Strange Victory*, by the Rev. Max A. C. Warren, General Secretary of the Church Missionary Society; and *The Ministry of the Word*, by the Rev. F. D. Coggan, D.D., Principal of the London College of Divinity (The Canterbury Press; 6s. net each). These are to be followed by a number of others on such subjects as the Bible, Baptism, the Church, and the Ministry. The books are attractively got up, inexpensive and written in a style that will make them acceptable to the ordinary intelligent and interested reader.

Of the three books now issued, probably the one for which there was greatest need is that on the Book of Common Prayer, and certainly it is an excellent piece of work. The contents of the Prayer Book are set against the historical background of the development of worship in the Church. The doctrinal basis of Christian worship has justice done to it; and we are allowed to see the growth of liturgical worship in the light of this dual basis. The part of the book dealing with primitive practice is particularly interesting. And in a general consideration of the place of the Prayer Book in present-day worship Mr. Harrison deals in a sensible and moderate way with the question that inevitably appears: Are the Prayer Book services capable of meeting the needs of the worshipping Christian of the twentieth century?

Strange Victory (the title is taken from Francis Brett Young's lines: 'Strange victory sprung from the fiery embers of defeat') is a study of the Holy Communion Service. Its doctrinal part is based on the 'Christus Victor' of Aulén, whose view of the Atonement is heartily accepted by Mr. Warren. The main part of the work is an exposition of the Communion Service in the Prayer Book.

The Ministry of the Word is of course a book on preaching. It consists of lectures which the author gave in various parts of Canada. They met with much acceptance there, and later when given to a group of clergy in London. The line taken is more or less that to be found in most of the innumerable books on the same subject. But the author has a mind of his own and what he says here is not borrowed from anybody. The Character of the Preacher, the Content of the Preaching and the Purpose of the Preaching give Dr. Coggan ample scope and his words would inspire with worthy aims any licentiate who listens to them with open mind.

F. J. Rae.

THE SCOTTISH COVENANTERS.

In a time when it has been in some quarters fashionable to regard the period of the Scots Covenanters as an old unhappy memory, not very important, that might be allowed to fade, no man has done more than the Rev. James Barr, B.D., with his great gift of popular oratory, to kindle and foster Scots pride in the martyrs of the Covenant. This book, *The Scottish Covenanters* (John Smith & Son (Glasgow); 12s. 6d. net), is in the main a pious compilation of the names and records of those heroic men and women, made with the same religious fervour and patriotic enthusiasm that was theirs. It may seem to modern historians that there was fanaticism in their identification of true religion with Presbyterianism and their furious resentment at any administrative control of the Church. But in the actual circumstances in which they lived their judgment was in accordance with the realities of the religious situation, and they died because they stood for the liberty of the individual and the Church to be in earnest about religion and to worship according to conscience. No tales of martyrdom are more thrilling and pathetic, no accounts of persecution more full of sordid brutalities than those that belong to the last quarter of the seventeenth century in Scotland.

This book at once provokes comparison with Johnston's 'Treasury of the Scottish Covenant' and it will not displace that magnificently deployed compendium of original references and authoritative pronouncements on the subject. But the different arrangement adopted by Mr. Barr in Part 2, the most valuable and largest part of his work, where he reviews the records and monuments of the martyrs in district after district, parish by parish, may serve better to stimulate local pride and interest in those who there in former days were shot or hanged or drowned, were driven into exile or sold into slavery because they insisted on worshipping God in their own way.

In the first part of the book, though the author seems to some extent to entertain the idea of weaving the material cited into a connected narrative, his interest is in the separate facts and documents presented and he does not seriously enter on any exposition or analysis of the course of events. On the second page in his reference to Knox's refusal of the bishopric of Rochester, Mr. Barr seems to take a view of Knox's attitude to episcopacy at that date which A. R. Macewen in his classic 'History of the Church in Scotland' in a carefully documented statement deliberately rejects. (Professor Macewen's volumes are an amazing omission in Mr. Barr's bibliography.)

The most intriguing pages here are on a point which one wishes the author had worked out in all

possible detail; he would have found it congenial to his social and political sympathies. It is this. What was the driving power behind the persecution of these mostly humble harmless folk? One can understand the desire of the administration for uniformity and the ejection of recalcitrant ministers from their official positions. But with what motive or by what instruments did the Government concern itself for years with the fact that numbers of the Scottish peasantry worshipped when they could on the moors? The answer Mr. Barr suggests, quoting J. King Hewison in support, is that the persecution was a huge financial racket. There was a double fine involved, one that might be taken as a token of the Government's zeal for religion, for non-attendance at church; a second, equally heavy, for attendance at a conventicle. The bankrupt gentry found in the collection of these exorbitant fines a way of retrieving their fortunes at the expense of thriving merchants and farmers. The great nobles and law officers shared with the Crown the plunder of landed estates, for there were men of substance, too, among the Covenanters. As in the Nazi spoliation of the Jews the ferocities of persecution were the technique of greedy, cold-blooded politicians using greedy gangsters as their tools. R. W. STEWART.

The Secrets of Victory (Church Book Room; 2s. 6d. net) contains for the most part sermons preached during the years of the War by the late Rt. Hon. and Rev. A. F. Winnington-Ingram, D.D., P.C., K.C.V.O., Bishop of London from 1901 to 1939. They are in the simple and graphic style known to readers of his former books. The Dedication is to Field-Marshal Sir Bernard Montgomery, and the Foreword emphasises the point that with all the dangers still ahead, starvation in Europe, divided counsels among the Allies, we shall need the same belief in Providence, the same faith in the activity of God, the same courage, the same patience, and the same co-operation with others as are outlined in this book.

The second volume of *Studia Semitica et Orientalia*, published by the Glasgow University Oriental Society (21s. net), has taken the form of a presentation volume to Professor W. B. Stevenson. It contains seven articles by old students of Dr. Stevenson, and it must be a deep source of gratification to him to feel that he has so worthily handed on the torch of learning. Himself too modest and retiring to put much of his great erudition into print, he will live in the generations who owe their inspiration ultimately to his teaching. The breadth of his interests and of the interests of his pupils is well illustrated in the wide variety of subjects treated in this volume, which includes articles on Arabic and the Islamic world, Syriac, Jewish law, and the Old Testament, together with a catalogue of the Oriental MSS. in the library of the University of Glasgow. For the Bible student two of them are particularly interesting. One is an acute critical study of the Balaam-Balak Songs and Saga by Professor J. Mauchline, and the other an account of the Hurrians by Professor J. Paterson. This last, especially, will serve as a very useful introduction to the study of a race which has in recent years received a great deal of attention from students of the ancient history of the Nearer East. As a rule, what is written on the subject assumes a knowledge which the average reader does not possess, but here we have a plain statement which has put the whole into clear light. The general editor is Professor C. J. Mullo Weir, B.D., who succeeded Dr. Stevenson on his retirement, and the latter is to be warmly congratulated on this evidence of the high standard of success which his life's work has attained.

The Christian Layman Looks Ahead (Independent Press; 5s. net), edited by the Rev. Frank H. Ballard, M.A., is a series of topical lay addresses. They were given in place of the sermon at evening worship in the Hampstead Garden Suburb Free Church, whose congregation is interdenominational not only in constitution but in practice. It is a tribute to the quality of the congregation that these very able addresses were delivered by members of it; nor does it appear that the congregation is at the end of its resources, for another series of topical addresses may be planned. The present series is concerned with the need for Christian thinking on such subjects as economics, industry, housing, youth, music, science, and vocational training. One of the most informative of the addresses is on 'The Press and the Pulpit.' It is by the late Mr. Gordon Robbins, President of the British Institute of Journalists. The outlook of the various writers is summed up thus by the Editor: 'The wounds of men and society are not to be healed lightly. Reforms never have been and never can be enough. Nothing is enough but in humility and repentance to accept the salvation God offers.'

Some time ago we drew attention to the project of a series of pamphlets in which Unitarians will state their faith. The general title of the series is 'Religion in a Changing World,' and the pamphlets will be published by the Lindsey Press at the cost of sixpence each. We have already taken note of the first three numbers, and now we take note of the next five: *God and Beauty*, by Mr. Basil Viney; *The Daring Church*, by the Rev. Arnold H. Lewis, B.D.; *A Unitarian's View of Mysticism*, by Mr. Sidney Spencer, B.A.; *Jesus and His Gospel*, by Mr. Wallace Tavener; *The Doctrine of the Trinity*, by Mr. Herbert Crabtree.

The pamphlets are attractively printed, and we find them all to be interesting and informative. In the first three we have the opinions of individuals who happen to be Unitarians rather than expositions of Unitarian opinion. It is different with the fourth and fifth, where the subjects call for Unitarian presentation and criticism. In the fourth pamphlet Mr. Tavener makes a contention that will be echoed not only by Unitarians but by Trinitarians who react from the new fashion in Protestant theology; it is that, as T. R. Glover said twenty-five years ago, 'in dealing with the

Christian religion, its ideas and the expression given to them, the first thing is to learn the mind of Jesus Himself.' The fifth pamphlet will also commend itself to many Trinitarians for its sketch of the historical development of the Trinitarian dogma, but while they will welcome its appreciation of the value of the dogma on its metaphysical side, they will not allow that its estimate of the historic Christ does justice to the facts of His mind and consciousness.

It is good to find such a book as *A First Introduction to the New Testament* coming to us from the Mission Field. It is written by the Rev. W. C. Somerville, B.Sc., Ph.D., of the Scottish Church College, Calcutta (Longmans; 2s. 6d. net). It is meant not for experts but for those to whom the New Testament is new (and that means to-day nearly everybody outside the pulpits and colleges!). It is divided into two parts. The first part deals with general questions ('What is it about? Who wrote it? When?), with background (the Jewish, Roman, and Greek worlds), with difficult matters (Did the miracles really happen? The Trinity), and with the message of the New Testament for to-day.

The second part treats in detail the books, taken in the order in which we find them. There are suggestions for further reading and two good maps. All this in an attractively got-up form for half a crown. But the first part itself is worth the price, for the matters discussed there are handled with such breadth of mind, such freshness and such helpfulness, as makes the book in its way a treasure.

A book by Dr. John R. Mott, with a clarion call to the Christian Church to take the tide at the flood and launch out on a movement of spiritual aggression, is called by him, *The Larger Evangelism* (Lutterworth Press; 5s. net). Dr. Mott has preached in more countries and to more individuals than almost any living man. He has earned the title of a Christian statesman. His work for students made his name known first of all, and his world-wide service was crowned by his appointment as Chairman of the World Council of Churches. In this book (the Jones Lectures at Emory University, 1944) he surveys the world he knows so well and sounds a note of extraordinary optimism. In country after country he points to evidence of a rising spiritual tide and bids us embark on it with confidence. Dr. Mott is not a superficial thinker, and the facts he cites from his own knowledge do enforce his eloquent appeal. This book is a call the Church cannot ignore.

The Post-War Preacher (Mowbray; 2s. net), by the Rev. A. E. Simpson, B.D., Canon Emeritus of Chester, is a book to be commended to preachers, especially young preachers. What to preach about, how to get one's thoughts into order, how to read and think and learn from experience, some faults to be avoided, some merits to be acquired—such, as the author himself tells us, are the matters of which he writes. And he writes simply and sincerely, and his words are full of wisdom. He emphasizes a point that the preacher is often unaware of—that there is a great longing on the part of frequenters of church services for assurance on questions of the life after death. This is certainly a subject on which more teaching is desirable than is commonly given.

An important work on Religious Education has been written by an experienced teacher—*The Teaching of Christian Doctrine in Schools and Colleges*, by Miss G. A. Richards, B.Sc. (Religious Education Press; 4s. net). The author has two convictions which she has put into a systematic form in her book, one is that the Christian Faith makes sense of the world, and the other that it can be taught in secondary schools as well as Training Colleges. We cannot be satisfied, she thinks, with the kind of Bible knowledge that many children imbibe from the religious lesson. It is the *truth* of Christianity that must be presented and grasped and applied to life. And this 'doctrine' can be taken in and understood by children at the secondary school age. In this assurance the author deals with the great Christian doctrines—God, man, sin, forgiveness, free-will, the Church, the Incarnation, the Cross, the Trinity, the Sacraments, and Prayer. We are grateful for the book, accept its basic creed, admire the skill of its construction, and wish it a wide influence in the teaching profession.

The Good News of Jesus, Infant Lessons on the agreed Syllabuses, by Miss Mary Entwistle, and *Christianity Goes into Action*, Lessons on great deeds in Christ's Name, by Mr. Ernest H. Hayes (Religious Education Press; 4s. and 5s. net respectively), are two excellent volumes of the Teachers' Guides published by the enterprising firm named. There is no need to dwell on the contents, for both writers are experts in their spheres. It may be said, however, that anybody who conducts a Bible Class of any kind will find ample material for subjects and illustrations in Mr. Hayes' book of great men and great deeds.

There are many books being issued with criticism and advice directed to the Church. One of these, which is meant especially for ministers of the Church of England, is *Laodicea in the Twentieth Century*, by Mr. Frank Bennett (S.P.C.K.; 1s. 6d. net). It is sponsored by the Rev. A. R. Vidler, who explains in a Foreword that the book had its origin in an article published in 'Theology' when Mr. Vidler was editor of this magazine (in 1944). This article brought down on its writer's head much criticism, not all of it undeserved, and commendation too. Both have been used in the development of the author's argument and the result is this little volume. The author is a good churchman and his wounds are those of a friend. What the wounds are like may be guessed from the title.

The Life of Jesus: A New Approach.

By the Reverend Roderic Dunkerley, B.A., B.D., Ph.D., Hockley, Essex.

How is 'the quest of the historical Jesus' progressing? Since Schweitzer wrote a great deal of work has been done, but with what result? Where has it brought us? Many will doubtless share with me the feeling that the present position is confused and in great need of clarification.

I.

Of course, there are those who deny altogether the validity of such a search. Their point of view may be summed up in the familiar saying that Jesus did not come to preach the gospel but to provide a gospel to be preached. Stress is laid upon Paul's apparent lack of interest in knowing Christ 'after the flesh,' and on the paucity of his references to the ministry and teaching of Jesus. Forsyth was, of course, the great modern protagonist of this position; he quotes with approval Luther as saying that there is more inspiration in the Epistles than in the Gospels.[1] But more recently the Barthians have laid the same emphasis; of their theology C. J. Cadoux says, 'As regards the quest for a better understanding of the historical Jesus, it has hitherto proved a hindrance rather than a help . . . it takes little interest in historical evidence as usually understood and still less in the character and doings of Jesus as a human being.'[2]

Much might be said in reply to this position and in support of the value and importance of 'the quest.' In the preface to his *What is the Faith?* Dr. Micklem says:

> 'With respect to the faith, the method and order of exposition differ from the method and order of appropriation. Dogmatics begins when the journey to Christ is accomplished; it starts, as I shall indicate, from the "divinity" of Jesus Christ; but the faith itself in His "divinity" will start normally from His humanity. Thus in his book, *The Son of God*, Professor Karl Adam says: 'The road to the "mysterium Christi" leads not across the uncontrollable secret places of the transcendental, past the precipices of the paradoxical and incredible, but over the bright open plain of the historical life of Jesus. This is the way of the faith, "per Jesum ad Christum," or more plainly with St. Augustine, "per hominem Christum tendis ad Deum Christum."'

But the best argument in favour of our contention is to be found in the words of Jesus Himself and in His own stress on the supreme importance of His teaching. 'Whosoever heareth *these sayings of mine* and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, which built his house upon a rock';[3] 'Whosoever shall be ashamed of me and of *my words* . . .';[4] 'Heaven and earth shall pass away: but *my words* shall not pass away.'[5] In the Fourth Gospel the emphasis is stronger still; see 6^{63} $12^{47.\ 48}$ $14^{21.\ 23.\ 24}$ $15^{7.\ 10}$. We may not be able to take all these latter as verbally from Jesus Himself, although I believe the Gospel does contain historical reminiscence and that some of its key sayings are authentic reports of what Jesus said. But the whole group impresses one as likely to represent a true tradition, to which the three Synoptic passages bear witness, that Jesus believed in the crucial value of His teaching. Which is, of course, only what might have been expected. He believed He came from God: He came preaching and teaching: then presumably He had a message to proclaim, and it was natural that He should stress the importance of it. Similarly, we would expect those who accept the thought that He came from God—was God's Anointed—was indeed the 'express image' of God, to stress the central importance of His earthly life and words and works. If it was worth God's while thus to manifest Himself in the flesh, every deed and saying should be treasured as of supreme and permanent worth.

Important practical issues are involved in this question. T. R. Glover in the opening pages of *The Jesus of History* contended that 'the most striking and outstanding fact in history' is this—that 'where new value has been found in Jesus Christ, the Church has risen in power, in energy, in appeal, in victory.' And alternatively, 'where Christ is not the living centre of everything, the value of the Church has declined, its life has waned.' He believed that the Church was 'not making enough of Jesus Christ.'[6] It was as a result of this conviction that he called the Church back to a new study of the Gospels, to see again and listen afresh to Him 'who spake as never man spake.' A Cambridge University Lecturer in Ancient History surely has a right to be heard in evidence when 'the most outstanding fact in history' is in question.

Here then is the plea with which I start this

[1] *The Person and Place of Jesus Christ*, 169.
[2] *The Historic Mission of Jesus*, 7 f.
[3] Mt 7^{24}. [4] Mk 8^{38}.
[5] Mk 13^{31}. [6] *Op. cit.*, 3 f.

present study. The quest of the historical Jesus is a vitally important business with deep significance for individual and social life. How is it progressing? The present position seems confused and unsatisfactory, and an attempt at clarification is justified.

II.

Amongst the many developments in this question since Schweitzer's 'thoroughgoing eschatology,' we must consider first what has generally come to be called Form Criticism. In directing attention again to the 'oral period' it has done useful service and may yet yield some permanent results. But the sceptical tendency so common amongst its exponents is I believe quite unwarranted and it ought to be constantly and emphatically queried whether their denials of the historicity of this and that in the Gospels are soundly and scientifically based. One is continually surprised at the easy-going way in which passages are dismissed as untrustworthy. Take, for example, this from Dibelius, by no means one of the extremists of this school:

> 'I have already ventured the supposition that in the story of the sons of Zebedee the passage Mk 10^{38-40} originally was lacking. Because it is interested in persons and their fate, it offers an example of what I have differentiated from paradigms as the beginnings of legend. This purely formal criticism is now supported also by historical considerations. Mk 10^{38-40} is evidently a *vaticinium ex eventu*, which is bound up with the pericope for the purpose of glorifying the martyrdom of the two brothers that had already taken place.'[1]

This does not appeal to me as scientific criticism; it is too casual and facile. Suppositions and presumptions and unbased assertions are not good enough in this business. And they are very common amongst these 'critics.'

There is, however, a more fundamental objection to this evaluation of the material in the Gospels. If, as we are told, it had largely taken its shape owing to the needs of preachers and controversialists of the Early Church and their desire to justify Church practices by reference to Jesus, why is it that the Gospels are so lacking in what might so evidently have been of great use for these purposes? One example must suffice. 'Salvation' is one of the great words of the Epistles; it is only once reported to have been used by Jesus and that in a passage which appears singularly remote from primitive preaching: 'This day is salvation come to this house, forsomuch as he also is a son of Abraham.'[2] How easy it would have been—if the Form Critics are right—for incidents to have been manipulated (or invented) to provide better foundation than this for the doctrine of salvation by faith. Easton makes a list of tenets held by the Early Church but scantily supported by sayings ascribed to Jesus.[3] It would certainly appear that primitive Christians were more sensitive to questions of historic truth than has been suggested.

I am bound to say I am not greatly impressed by R. H. Lightfoot's Bampton Lectures (1934) on *History and Interpretation in the Gospels*—one of the principal books in English on this method of study. One example of what I must call the frailty of his argument may be given. He speaks of the writer of St. Mark's Gospel having a 'strong liking for the number three.' But—(1) if three persons or parables or incidents are mentioned, it may have been simply because there were three!—the liking being not for the number but for the fact; (2) in order to make Mark 4^{35}–5^{43} appear a grouping of three acts of power he suggests that the writer regarded the episode of the woman with the issue of blood as an essential part of the story of Jairus; (3) he speaks of the writer grouping *five* stories of conflict (2^{1}–3^{6}), so that his preference for three cannot have been very strong; (4) he ignores the fact, as so many others do who speak of that as a deliberate grouping of incidents, that in the midst of it we have the important little story of the call of Levi. It all gives one the impression of pawing the story over instead of reading it with imagination and vision—the most thrilling story ever written.

Another recently developed line of thought which I believe has made for confusion rather than for clarity is Dr. Dodd's 'realized eschatology.' It has of course long been recognized that Jesus spoke of the Kingdom as in some sense already present. 'If I cast out devils by the Spirit of God, then the kingdom of God is come unto you.'[4] Where, as supremely in Him, God is acknowledged and His will is done, there the Kingdom is already in existence, somewhat as an Empire might be regarded as having been established wherever the flag was set up—however much colonization and administrative settlement remained to be done. But to exalt and extend this idea so that it excludes or minimises the thought of the future coming of the Kingdom is surely an error, and this is what Dodd virtually does. 'This declaration that the Kingdom of God has already come necessarily dislocates the whole eschatological scheme in which its expected coming closes the long vista of the future.'[5] Such a view can only be maintained by strangely

[1] *From Tradition to Gospel*, 60. [2] Lk 19^{9}.

[3] *The Gospel before the Gospels*, 101, 106, 109.
[4] Mt 12^{28}.
[5] *The Parables of the Kingdom*, 49.

violent treatment of the evidence. The opening proclamation of Jesus' ministry, 'The kingdom of God is at hand,'[1] is unjustifiably interpreted to mean 'The Kingdom has come'; the prayer, 'Thy kingdom come,' is practically ignored; and the eschatological expectation of the Early Church is left without any sure basis in the teaching of Jesus and is therefore quite unaccountable. Practically, too, I find this view seriously lacking in challenge; any urgency it contains belongs to the far distant past; it does not stir us to-day with vision and hope. And we surely have a right to expect this of any Christian interpretation of Jesus in a world and a generation so obviously needing redemption as ours.[2]

Again, I do not feel that Rudolf Otto's *The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man* has made any substantial contribution to our quest. In certain quarters it was greeted enthusiastically as though it provided the clue from the Book of Enoch to Jesus' use of these terms and so to His own self-consciousness. But C. J. Cadoux[3] has rightly suggested that Otto's almost complete lack of reference to Dn $7^{13f.}$ for the purpose of explaining what Jesus meant by the phrase 'the Son of Man' detracts very seriously from the value of his interpretation.

III.

Turning now to the other side of the picture, from the many brilliant studies of the Gospels since Schweitzer I would choose three as contributing most to our understanding of the Jesus of History, on what we may call the main line of our quest.

There is first the argument of Dr. F. C. Burkitt on the general trustworthiness of the Gospel material.[4] He starts from the position that on *a priori* grounds we should not have expected much genuine information about the life of Jesus to have survived. His reason for this is not simply the strength of the anticipation in the Early Church of His return, which necessarily lessened interest in the past, but the fact that very speedily the centre of gravity shifted from Palestine to Greece—the details of what had happened in Galilee three quarters of a century before were not likely to be of great moment to Corinthian city folk living under entirely different conditions at the end of the first century. Why then should such documents as the Synoptics have been either written or retained? The facts that they were written, did survive, and that on investigation they reveal many traces of primitive matter, are very surprising and constitute proof of 'a strong element of personal reminiscence.'[5] He refers to 'the general historical faithfulness of the picture of our Lord's ministry sketched in Mark,' and to 'the very considerable degree of faithfulness and historical intelligence shown by the other two Synoptists in essentials.'[6] One example only of the evidence that so impressed Burkitt can be given. The statement of Jesus, 'If a woman shall put away her husband, and be married to another, she committeth adultery,'[7] is 'one of the really primitive features of the Gospel of Mark.' It is a veiled allusion to Herodias' desertion of Philip in order to live with Antipas, and 'is singularly appropriate in the time and place.'[8] The Pharisees' question about divorce, in connexion with which it occurs, was a deliberate attempt to embroil Him with the court and bring about His downfall—as had happened in the case of John the Baptist.

We come next to Canon Streeter's outstanding work *The Four Gospels*. The contributions it has made to the textual criticism of the Gospels and to the Johannine question are very valuable, but its great importance is in his 'Four Document Hypothesis.' Like the Form Critics he believed in the necessity for studying 'the historical conditions under which the Gospels were produced,' but unlike them he stressed 'the preponderating influence of the great Churches in the determination of the thought and literature of primitive Christianity,'[9]—a factor of cardinal importance, which has been commonly ignored. He shows strong reason for thinking that Jerusalem, Caesarea and Antioch 'must each have had a cycle of tradition of its own,' and that 'it is in the last degree improbable that the characteristic traditions of any of these three Churches have completely disappeared.' Conditions and interests varied considerably in them and in Rome—the last of the four 'Great Churches'—but there is a high probability that in each of them authentic information about Jesus was available and cherished. Streeter disposes of the 'quite illusory

[1] Mk 1^{15}.

[2] We may compare H. V. Martin writing in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES (November 1939) thus: 'Realized Eschatology, as interpreted for instance by Dr. C. H. Dodd, lacks this sense of hope or expectation for something still ahead.' Similarly, Professor Godfrey Phillips, in the same periodical (July 1943), calls attention to 'an unexpected sequel (to the theory of realized eschatology) in the present-day life of the Church, namely enfeeblement of hope regarding what is to come after the present war.'

[3] *Op. cit.*, 99.

[4] It is elaborated in *The Gospel History and its Transmission* (1906), *The Earliest Sources for the Life of Jesus* (1910), and *Christian Beginnings* (1924). There is also an excellent short statement of his views in *Antiquity* (March 1930).

[5] *Antiquity* (March 1930, p. 17).

[6] *Sources*, 108, 109.

[7] Mk 10^{12}.

[8] *Transmission*, 100.

[9] *Op. cit*, 230.

pre-eminence' often ascribed to the document Q—as though there were something 'just a little discreditable to any saying of our Lord if it cannot be traced to Q.'[1] And he maintains that one result of his study 'is very materially to broaden the basis of evidence for the authentic teaching of Christ.'[2] The neglect of these contentions in such a book as Lightfoot's *History and Interpretation in the Gospels* is strange. Granting that Streeter's views require to be supplemented by further investigation regarding the gathering and shaping of the local traditions in the Great Churches, and that the Form Critics may have some help to give here, the question remains, why three 'Gospels' (of the Synoptic type) should ever have come into existence at all and in particular why Mark should have survived when it had been so largely incorporated in the other two. And I believe that Burkitt and Streeter together give us the soundest approach we have yet had to this aspect of the problem of Gospel origins, with the general trustworthiness of the records as corollary.

On this basis we come to the third major contribution to our quest—C. J. Cadoux's recent work, *The Historic Mission of Jesus* (1941). His interest is in the content of the tradition not in the method by which it has been handed on. And a most painstaking and detailed enquiry leads him to posit two facts, not generally recognized by scholars, which are bound to 'affect very profoundly any reconstruction we may make of the purpose and forecast of Jesus.'[3] This clearly suggests something of primary importance for an historical study of the Life of Jesus, and it is strange that Cadoux's book has not so far aroused greater interest and its significance been more widely realized. Cadoux is either right or wrong: if he is right, then he has given us a long neglected clue to the understanding of Jesus, and scholarship must either accept it or prove him mistaken. 'The two facts in question are these: firstly, Jesus' expectation, at the beginning of his ministry, that he would be accepted and followed as Messiah by Israel, not repudiated and martyred; and secondly, his deep interest and concern over the dangerous mutual attitude of Israel and Rome, and his strenuous effort to avert the threatened clash of arms between them.'[4] My own interpretation of these facts and what follows from them differs in certain respects from Cadoux's, as I shall in due course make clear. But I agree entirely with him that they *are* facts—that the evidence points conclusively to them, and that they are quite crucial for our understanding of the Jesus of history.

[1] *Op. cit.*, 227. [2] *Op. cit.*, 270.
[3] *Op. cit.*, 18. [4] *Ib.*

IV.

It is impossible to outline here the whole of the evidence on which Cadoux's case rests, but I will make two quotations which will adequately state the position.

> 'Jesus' lamentation over those Galilean towns which did not repent (Lk 10^{13-15}, Mt 11^{20-24} Q) suggests very strongly that He was disappointed with them. Still less mistakeable is the tone of disappointment in His address to Jerusalem: "O, Jerusalem, Jerusalem! . . . How often have I wished to gather thy children together, as a mother-bird gathers her brood of nestlings under her wings, and ye would not come!" (Lk 13^{34}, Mt 23^{37} Q.) There is no good reason for doubting the accuracy of the record of these words. . . .
>
> 'Side by side with these well-attested words, and in confirmation of them, we may set the somewhat less strongly attested, but very credible, account of what happened as Jesus approached Jerusalem for the last time. "And as he drew near, having caught sight of the city, he wept over it, saying, O, if only thou hadst come to know, even at this (late) day, the things (needful) for thy peace! But now, they have been hidden from thine eyes! . . . thou knowest not the season of thy visitation (from God)!" (Lk 19^{41-44} L.)
>
> 'Now if Jesus spoke in this way, and meant what He said, and was not simply indulging in meaningless stage-play or unintelligent fatalism, He was expressing real and passionate disappointment. No feasible alternative view is possible. If these utterances do not evince a most poignant sense of frustration, they mean nothing. But to say that is to say also that Jesus had formerly and for some considerable time expected confidently that the children of Jerusalem would flock together under Him, and that the city *would* realize that His ministry was a Divine visitation, and *would* eagerly accept His message as essential for her peace. It is submitted that these three passages of themselves are sufficient proof of the thesis here maintained.'[5]

Again:

> 'How can it be maintained that Jesus calculated from the first on being rejected and martyred by His fellow-countrymen, and that He purposely made plans in order to be so martyred, when we find Him passionately lamenting that Khorazin and Bethsaida and Kapharnaum had not repented at the sight of His deeds of power and that the children of Jerusalem had not gathered together under Him or seen their true welfare in accepting His ministry as a Divine visitation? Why the tears shed and the agonized regret outpoured on the ride into Jerusalem, if the whole tragic event was from the first a foregone conclusion, which Jesus Himself was on His own initiative going out of His way to bring about? There are other supplementary considerations which support the view that the unresponsiveness of the nation and the plot against His life were a real frustration of His hopes: but—unless we are to ascribe to Him an attitude of mind inconsistent with all else that we know about Him—the case is settled for us by

[5] *Op. cit.*, 191 f.

this evidence, just adduced of His real and profound disappointment.' [1]

That the significance of these passages has been very frequently neglected may be illustrated by the following points. McNeile in his Commentary on *Matthew* gives no hint at $11^{20f.}$ that Jesus was feeling frustration and disappointment; Headlam in his *Life and Teaching of Jesus the Christ* ignores the passage altogether, as does Gore in his *Jesus of Nazareth*; in Peake's *Commentary*, there is no suggestion that the two laments over Jerusalem were *real*—that Jesus was bitterly grieved because of what had not happened. 'I would . . . but ye would not!' Many other examples of the neglect of these crucial words might be cited.

I believe then that Cadoux has rendered most valuable service in emphasising these points and that his conclusions must have a profound influence on our 'quest' in the future.

V.

Now, there is one important respect in which Cadoux has not so far carried the matter out to its logical issue. I submit that this emphasis—on the expectation of Jesus at the beginning of His ministry, and on His sense of frustration later on—gives us the badly needed clue to the puzzle of the sequence of events in His life. It helps us to fit the various elements of the story into a coherent whole and to arrange the incidents and teachings together to give a consistent picture of His life.

A clear idea of the course of events, Schweitzer says, 'can only be arrived at hypothetically by an experimental reconstruction based on the necessary inner connexion of the incidents. Every Life of Jesus remains therefore a reconstruction on the basis of a more or less accurate insight into the nature of the dynamic self-consciousness of Jesus which created the history.' [2] I believe that Cadoux has given us a more accurate insight of this kind than before and that with this clue we find a new 'necessary inner connexion' between different parts of the story, and that it is therefore really possible to write a Life of Jesus in orderly sequence.

The test of coherence is, I maintain, a very valuable one. A hypothetical reconstruction which gives a pattern into which many well-authenticated parts of the story will not fit is obviously under grave suspicion. And alternatively, when parts cohere happily, almost as of necessity, and form a natural sequence, the probability of the reconstruction being well founded is greatly enhanced. An illustration suggests itself. We are accustomed in detective stories to see the sleuth framing a hypothesis in view of certain evidence which he deems of primary significance; then perhaps some new facts emerge which will not fit in; a new hypothesis has to be sought—several perhaps are attempted—and then at last, hey presto! the intractable facts fall into place and the problem is resolved.

Many examples might be given of hypothetical reconstructions of the Life of Jesus breaking, so to speak, on certain intractable facts—points in the story, which on literary grounds there is no reason to doubt, not fitting in, so that they must either be ignored or the hypothesis is proved inadequate. Keim rejected the weeping at the gates of Jerusalem—it did not cohere with his scheme; so much the worse for his scheme! [3] Schweitzer was clearly embarrassed by the Triumphal Entry and reduced to the desperate expedient of saying it was Messianic for Jesus but not for His followers; so much the worse for 'thoroughgoing eschatology.' [4] Dodd finds the expectation of the Early Church out of harmony with the idea that the Kingdom had already come; so much the worse for 'realized eschatology.' [5]

I contend that Cadoux has called our attention to certain significant facts which cannot be ignored. They may have been intractable so far as one or another previous hypothesis has been concerned, but they must be dealt with. And so they open the way for a new hypothetical reconstruction of the Life of Jesus. And the remarkable thing is the very large measure of coherence that is found in the story when it is traced from this angle and with this emphasis. I am not foolish enough to say that everything at once falls into place; there are still so many questions of authenticity and interpretation that are still moot. But I have been greatly impressed by what Cadoux calls, 'the general coherence of the resultant picture.' [6]

One instance only can be given. Midway in the story we have the Parable of the Fig Tree (Lk 13^{6-9}); immediately after the Entry and Cleansing of the Temple we have the Parable of the Vineyard (Mk 12^{1-8}). These parables are in their proper places if our hypothesis is correct; if their position was reversed, the whole story would be incoherent.

This view is, of course, directly opposed to the position of the Form Critics that the Gospels are conglomerations of almost entirely unrelated tales and teachings—without sequence or coherence, and that it is not possible to write a consecutive Life of Jesus. I have already outlined certain reasons for grave dissatisfaction with this method of study, and I now submit that the clue which Cadoux has forced into prominence makes a review of the whole question imperative.

[1] *Ib.*, 251. [2] *Op. cit.*, 392 f.
[3] *Jesus of Nazara*, V. 112. [4] *Op. cit.*, 392.
[5] *The Apostolic Preaching*, 91 f. [6] *Op. cit.*, 337.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Mind the Stop!

By the Reverend Charles M. Hepburn, B.D., Crieff.

'And God rested on the seventh day.'—Gn 2^{2}.

Among school subjects which worries you most? Some of you, it may be, are not very good at grammar. One of the things that used to bother me a bit when I was school age, and sometimes still does, was punctuation, dividing sentences with the necessary points and marks. It was quite a relief to me therefore to find in a bookshop a short time ago a small book with the title *Mind the Stop!* It was further summed up as

'A handy and really original book
on the ever open question of punctuation.'

This matter of putting in stops, however, has often worried and puzzled even famous writers, for instance, that celebrated American writer Mark Twain. On one occasion he had a novel idea for saving himself, although not his unhappy editor, trouble. At the end of an article he sent to his publishers he put a string of stops:

. ! ( ) , - ; :

and wrote underneath, 'Please scatter these throughout according to your taste.'

There are punctuation marks, however, in life too and, unlike Mark Twain, we have to put them in ourselves, if we are to make the most of life. Suppose we take one or two instances of it.

One not to forget to use is ?—a question mark. It is only by asking questions we shall learn about life. So it's well to put in plenty of them when you are young. A short time ago a member of Parliament said that, when he was a teacher, he had a pupil who *would* think that seven sevens were forty-six. So one morning he made him say twenty times 'Seven sevens are forty-nine.' When he said it for the twentieth time he turned to his master and said, 'Why are they?' Now that lad was worth teaching, because he wasn't satisfied to soak things up like blotting-paper, but was anxious to understand and so persisted in asking why. So, although it may be a bother sometimes to parents and teachers, keep on asking questions, put in plenty of question marks, for that is one of the pathways to knowledge.

Another important punctuation mark we should use frequently is !—an exclamation mark. An exclamation mark indicates wonder or surprise. Sometimes when we see a magnificent sunset tinting the sky with exquisite colours we can't help exclaiming, 'Oh! how wonderful!' And it's a dull soul indeed that is never stirred to admiring wonder. It's good, too, to be struck with wonder sometimes for this reason, that 'the steep white way of wonder,' as some one remarked, is one way that brings us nearer to God. One writer, after speaking of the wonderful works of God, such as the sunsets that are never twice the same, goes on to say:

All of the things that man controls,
The visions that he makes true,
Never were half so wonderful as
The miracles God can do.

Put in then as often as ever possible the exclamation mark of wonder.

And then an appropriate punctuation mark to finish with is .—a period, a full stop. Now that is one thing we need in life as well as in letters. It's unwise to rush about all the time and never rest. Isn't that one of the objects of holidays? And it is the object of Holy days too. Sunday, for instance, is God's great full stop: for not even He who made the heavens and the earth thought it wise to work on without a stop. So there is no question we need our rest 'on the seventh day,' taking things quietly one day in the week that we may be ready for the duties of the other six days. And there's also this. God is thought of in the Bible as saying, 'Be still, and know that I am God,' for it is only by being still and making a stop to think about Him that we will be able to know Him as we ought.

Apple Trees Saved by an Insect.

By the Reverend J. Clifford Mitchell, Birkenhead.

'There is a lad here.'—Jn 6^{9}.

An insect is very small. This one named Aphelinus Mali Hald—how would you like to have a name like that?—is smaller than a pin's head; that is very tiny. Yet how wonderful is the work done by this little insect. The man who tells us about this small creature writes: 'A new insect has been set to work in our apple orchards, and it is doing a magnificent job in ridding us of woolly aphis, one of our worst orchard pests.' Aphelinus was brought to England in 1924 and set to work in orchards in Scadbury where it attacked the woolly aphis with good results.

The woolly aphis eats the wood, not the fruit of an apple tree, doing a great deal of harm, spoiling the strength of the tree. Aphelinus has already saved fruit growers large sums of money by helping them to destroy the pest which does a lot of harm to their apple trees.

When I first heard of clever Aphelinus I thought of the man who has a large apple orchard in Evesham. I could see him going into his orchard after Aphelinus had been there working, and saying to this very tiny insect, 'Aphelinus, you are not very big, why, I can hardly see you, but thank you so much for driving woolly aphis away.'

Little Aphelinus says to every small boy and girl 'there is a lot of good work you can do in this world. You can help to drive out of God's lovely world those evil things that do a great deal of harm.' Evil actions and evil thoughts do a lot of harm. Unkindness and selfishness help to fill this world with unhappiness. However small you are, you can do kind deeds, think kind thoughts, be unselfish, and help to bring joy into the lives of your friends. I remember one day walking down a street in which a number of children were playing a game. One girl was standing near looking very sad. I found that the other children had refused to allow her to join in the game. A few minutes later one girl left the group of children and going up to the other who looked so sad, said, 'Come on, and join in with us.' The little girl smiled, and soon her sadness had gone, sent away by the kindness of the girl who invited her to join in the fun.

You know that New Testament story of Jesus and the small boy who had a few fish and a few loaves? Jesus said to him, 'I want you to help me feed five thousand people.' The boy must have opened his eyes widely, and looked up at Jesus, then he handed over his small parcel of food.

Boys and girls, Jesus wants your help. Don't say, 'Oh, I'm too small to do anything.' Remember the good work being done by tiny Aphelinus, and say to Jesus who came to give His life for us, 'Here is my small voice, my small hands, and my small feet, take them and use them in your service,' and He will use them as He used the small parcel of food carried by a small boy.

The Christian Year.

FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

A Perennial Question.

BY THE REVEREND RODERICK BETHUNE, M.A., ABERDEEN.

'Pilate saith unto him, What is truth?'—Jn 18^{38}.

Pilate, before whom Jesus was arraigned, has an unenviable reputation. We are reminded of it every time we repeat the opening sentences of the Apostles' Creed—'I believe in Jesus Christ His only Son our Lord; who was conceived by the Holy Ghost; born of the Virgin Mary; suffered under Pontius Pilate . . .' His name, in other words, is and for ever will be associated with the crucifixion of Jesus.

There is little doubt, of course, that he felt himself in a very awkward situation—a fact which, I think, this question which he addressed to Jesus bears out. It was framed as a result of an utterance of Jesus in which, declaring that He had come into the world to bear witness unto the truth and that every one who was of the truth must hear His voice, He plainly indicated to Pilate that, that being so, there was only one honourable course open to him and that was to declare Him innocent and set Him free. 'What is truth?' asked Pilate, suggesting that the issue was not nearly so clear to him as it appeared to be to Jesus. How was he to know when a thing was true? Wasn't a decision difficult to reach in the presence of such conflicting opinions? And, supposing it possible to reach a decision, what was truth anyway—was it something which a man must follow regardless of the consequences?

There have been many since Pilate's day who have felt themselves in precisely Pilate's position. Faced by what others declared unequivocally to be the truth, they have asked Pilate's question, 'What is truth?' and, perhaps because, like Pilate, they have not stayed for an answer, they have been led into actions whose memory is very difficult to live down.

Suppose we think of some of the people who ask Pilate's question and of the answer which should be given them and in the light of which they ought to be living.

1. Some ask the question, as perhaps Pilate asked it, because they profess to find it difficult to determine truth from falsehood. There are some who profess to be in this very difficulty every time they hear the gospel proclaimed by a minister of Jesus Christ. They agree that the statements he makes are oftentimes very impressive, that the fulfilment of the promises he makes in religion's name would be very desirable—but how do they know, how can they know, whether the whole thing is true or whether it is compounded of falsehood and deception?

A leading thinker of our day and generation, with perhaps such people in mind, recently set himself to answer that question. You know that a thing is true, he says, first, because when you hear it expressed you instinctively feel it to be true; secondly, because you verify it in your own experience, and thirdly, because, on reflection, it fits into and makes sense of the rest of your experience. If some declare that they find it difficult to believe whether what Jesus said, or what is said in His name, is true or false, have never really listened carefully to what is said, have never tried to put it to the proof in their own experience, have never properly considered whether it fits into and makes sense of the rest of their experience, little wonder they are in a difficulty and, being in a difficulty, proceed, as Pilate proceeded, to perform actions whose memory they cannot live down.

2. But others ask Pilate's question, not simply because they find the general question of truth and falsehood difficult to answer, but because they find so many people saying different things and all of them claiming at the same time that they speak the truth. Who, among all the speakers, is to be believed?

People, for example, profess to find it difficult to decide upon religion because of the number and the variety of the denominations. Each of them seems to be saying something different from the others, and many are claiming that the truth is to be found within the boundaries of their fellowship and nowhere else. Who, among all the speakers, is to be believed?

While admitting the confusion which sometimes results from so many different denominations, and especially from the apparently exclusive pronouncements made by some of them in particular, one feels that the apparent disunity is sometimes allowed to obscure the real underlying unity which characterizes all who acknowledge allegiance to Jesus Christ. Protestants and Roman Catholics, for example, may worship God in very different ways, they may emphasize different aspects of Jesus Christ, but such things should not obscure from us the fact that Protestants and Roman Catholics alike believe that God has spoken to the world in Jesus Christ and, believing that, try to order their lives in the light of His teaching. The real underlying unity and agreement which characterize Christians was never better demonstrated than during, and even prior to, the recent war, in some of the Continental countries where a philosophy of life inimical to everything Christian was being propagated. With one voice Protestant and Roman Catholic alike protested, and alike shared the suffering and the humiliation of prison and of concentration camp because of their stand.

Such an illustration should remind those of us who profess to find it difficult to decide upon religion because of the number and the variety of the denominations that there is truth which is primary and truth which is secondary, and that the secondary, the insistence which some place upon the manner and method of worship, for example, should not obscure for us truth which is primary, what all Christians, however they may worship, believe about Jesus.

A. E. Whitham, one of the most gifted men God ever gave to His Church, and whose death at so early an age was so widely lamented, has a chapter in one of his books upon this very point. 'There are,' he says, 'important truths that are true for the East but not for the West, for the West though not for the East. There are secondary matters of real value that appeal to one temperament but not to another, attitudes and ideas that appeal to different ages and stages of life. But primary truth, truth of the very heart and inmost nature of God, must be for Jew and Gentile, barbarian, Scythian, bond and free . . . and hold within its very nature the promise of universal acceptance.'

3. But others ask Pilate's question, 'What is truth?' because truth as it is represented to them conflicts with something they very much wish to do. Is it more important that they should follow truth, whatever it may cost, than that they should pursue dishonest policies which will give them position and possession, more important that they should follow truth than that they should try to save their own skins? What is truth? Is it just convention, the fad of a much too particular minority which may be safely ignored, or something which a man must follow if he is to be true to himself?

It has been held by some, and the narrative seems to justify their position, that Pilate was persuaded of Jesus' innocence, that he was convinced that Jesus rather than His enemies spoke the truth. If that were the case, then he probably posed the question to himself as well as to Jesus because he was in two minds whether it was more important that he should follow the truth, even though following it caused an uprising and his consequent recall, or whether it was more important that he should save himself and his position. He decided that the latter was more important and let Jesus, the embodiment of the truth, be crucified. But to-day he is branded as a coward.

His story ought to provide the answer to the question which so many, particularly those who are young, are asking. Are honesty, and honour, are character and integrity, the fads of a minority which we may safely ignore, or are they among the things which, rather than lose them, we should prefer to die? There are some in our day and generation, the exponents of what is called the 'New Morality,' who declare them to be fads—but, as some one has said, the new morality which they profess to expound is not morality and it is not new. It is as old as man—and its record is not one which makes for pleasant reading. Men and women, proclaiming truth, honesty and honour, character and integrity, to be fads, have played fast and loose with them—but their names are held in precisely the same dishonour as is the name of Pilate.

Instead of listening to those who tell us that truth may be disregarded, let us listen to Him whose life, on every one's reckoning, was the most perfect, the most balanced, the world has ever known. 'Whosoever,' He said, 'heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, which built his house upon a rock: And the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell not: for it was founded upon a rock.' Truth is more important than anything else. To follow it may cost us dear. But at the end, unlike Pilate, we shall have a soul we shall be able to call our own and a memory untroubled by regret. 'What is truth?' asked Pilate, but did not stay for an answer. Let all who are asking that question now stay until the answer has been received and, when it has been received, let them follow it cost them what it may.

FIFTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Christian Criteria.

BY THE REVEREND T. TUDOR RHYS, B.A., B.D., HINCKLEY.

'Our Father . . .'—Mt 6$^{9ff.}$.

Some prayers, like Peter's cry for help, 'Lord, save me,' are private and personal. But our Lord's Prayer is a corporate or communal prayer. It is a prayer for a whole world in which men and women live and work together. 'Our Father . . .'

It is therefore *the* prayer for to-day. Because, to-day, we are living in a world whose key-word is the word 'community.' You hear the word everywhere. We are becoming, perhaps unaware, community-minded. If you had fallen asleep ten years ago and had not awakened until yesterday

you would be surprised, perhaps shocked, by the extent to which human life in this democratic country of ours is 'controlled' by a benevolent Government. We are living, quite admittedly, in a closely planned community, and it seems as though that had come to stay. Some years ago a man could decide for himself what he was to do in these or those circumstances, but now, quite often, he must decide, not as an individual, but as a member of a group, a union, a party, a class, a community. That is well and good. No man liveth unto himself. But for us Christians there is one community which has the primacy, and if at any time it should happen that any of these lesser loyalties should press their claims upon us, are there any criteria whereby we may judge what our belief and behaviour should be as members of the community of Christ? Yes, there are, and we shall find some of them in the great charter of the Christian community, our Lord's Prayer.

1. *Christian Order*—'Our Father which art in heaven, Hallowed be thy name.' The Christian order is not a merely social, political, economic, or industrial order, it is a divine order. It is founded, not on men's relationship to Nature or even to one another, but to God. 'It is the God-relationship,' said Kierkegaard, 'which makes man a man.'

The name of God is stamped upon everything that God has made, especially upon man. This is God's world, and man is God's child. In the Christian order it is not things that come first, or systems, or even the State—but persons. 'For religion,' said G. K. Chesterton, 'all men are equal, as all pennies are equal, because the only value in any of them is that they bear the image of the King.' And that King is our Father.

2. *Christian Progress*—'Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven.' Can the Kingdom of God, in its fullness and perfection, ever come here on earth? Yes, in so far as the conditions of time and space will allow. But we should remember, as Berdyaev reminds us, that time and space are themselves imperfect and that 'the perfect state is impossible within history itself, it can only be realized outside its framework.' If I may put it positively, Christian progress does not stop at any point here 'on earth,' it only starts. The first thing that a Christian should believe is in the reality of the eternal world. The real world is not confined to what may be grasped by the senses. The real world is the spiritual world. Man is ear-marked for immortality. Man has for ever, and the end and goal of human progress, Christians believe, does not lie here on earth, but in heaven, in the eternal world. Christian progress has the scope and fling of eternity. '. . . as it is in heaven.'

3. *Christian Freedom*—'Give us this day our daily bread.' But why bring God into all that? What has God to do with matters of production and consumption? Will not a just democracy, or whatever one's ideal system may be, arrange all those details and fulfil all men's needs? The answer is that there is something involved with which God has very much to do. The whole matter of human freedom is bound up with the way in which men and women earn their living. The plain fact is, that in this world there is not such a thing as absolute freedom. A man is only free to choose his own master. Being saved (in all senses of the word) is to choose the right master. Either God or Mammon. There is no other alternative. 'Give us this day our daily bread.' That is vitally relevant. God is the Master in this, His own world, and perfect freedom for men and for nations is to serve Him and to do His will.

4. *Christian Responsibility*—'And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors.' 'Forgive us our trespasses' is another version. A 'trespass' is a positive step in the wrong direction. When you trespass you go where you ought not to go, you do what you ought not to do, you say what you ought not to say. But when I look back I find that what worries me is not so much the wrong things that I have done as the right things that I have not done. The things that rankle in my mind as time goes on are my lost opportunities, my neglected duties, and the responsibilities that I have shirked. 'Forgive us our debts, for we also . . .'

President Truman said a great thing the other day. There was a demand in some quarters for the arrest and punishment of the General and Admiral who were in charge at Pearl Harbour when the Japanese attacked it. 'No,' said the President, 'I don't agree. The men on the spot were not alone responsible. All the American people were responsible. We all shared in the general unpreparedness of the time.'

And so we do. Social irresponsibility, we are told, was one of the first of human sins: 'Am I my brother's keeper?' It is one of the sins of to-day, too. A cliché that is going the rounds at the moment is: 'Don't blame me!' We shall have to start all over again by taking our share of responsibility and by feeling a sense of corporate guilt. 'Forgive us our debts, as we also have forgiven our debtors.'

5. *Christian Revolution*—'And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil.' Where does the Christian revolution begin? 'Lead us not into temptation.' Put a man in good surroundings and he will not even be tempted to do wrong! That is what Robert Owen used to say long ago: 'Man's character is made for and not by him.'

But it does not follow. That was the first object lesson that man was ever taught. Our mother, Eve, in her paradisaical home bends over her second little baby boy and she whispers his name, Abel. But the name has no derivation. It is just a sigh, 'an expression of disappointed hope.' Even in that lovely home something had gone wrong.

That is where it always begins, for better or for worse: not in one's environment, but in oneself. Things are made out of thoughts, the visible out of the invisible. '. . . but deliver *us* from evil.' You cannot improve the world faster than you can improve yourself. No man has any right to expect the world to be better than he is prepared to be himself. That is where the Christian revolution starts: not with processes but with persons. '. . . but deliver *us*.'

6. *Christian Victory*—'For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory.' 'Till we have built Jerusalem.' So sang William Blake, and the hymn is a stirring one. But the emphasis is all wrong. Till *we* have *built*? No, not in that way will the Kingdom come. The final victory is not the fruit of our building but the faith of our believing—in 'the forgiveness of sins, the resurrection of the body and the life eternal.' And all these pre-requisites of the Kingdom are not gotten by us, they are given to us by God in Christ Jesus, His Son. In a word, we shall conquer, not by winning the victory, but by trusting the Victor. 'For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen.'

SIXTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Individual Responsibility.

BY THE REVEREND STEWART MECHIE, M.A., EDINBURGH.

'And they all with one consent began to make excuse.'—Lk 14^{18}.

Notice the nature of the failure depicted in this Parable. 'With one consent' suggests common deliberation and concerted action, as if all the invited guests, including the three mentioned as typical, met together and in common resolved to insult their host by absenting themselves from his supper. That view of the matter is not required by the Greek and the probabilities are against it. More likely each man's excuse was perfectly valid in his own eyes. He had good reason not to go, and, in any case, he would never be missed, for of course all the others would be there. One can imagine how each would have dismissed the excuses of the others as lame and unsatisfactory. One has bought a piece of ground. What difference does a few days sooner or later make to him? Another has bought five yoke of oxen. Why not prove them another day? Another has just been married. Why, he is the very man to enjoy a great supper; he is in festive mood already! The truth is they were all a little preoccupied, more intent on their own affairs than on honouring their host's invitation. They had no desire to insult him, far from it. There was no conspiracy. What they had in common was an inward identity of mood—the mood of preoccupation with their own concerns—and that led each of them to the common conclusion. It was a vast corporate insult and yet it was not done deliberately and by concerted action. Each man acts as if he were an exception; and so the exception, made by each and all, becomes the rule. Thus the wrong is done; and the voice of judgment condemns them all, for they all are responsible. 'None of those men which were bidden shall taste of my supper.' The responsibility for the corporate failure lies at the door of a great many individuals of whom we hear of three; but the failure is far greater than any one of them intended or imagined. The failure is so vast as to become an insult to the host, and yet none of them intended an insult.

In such matters there is what might be called an increment of association. We do something or fail to do something: it seems a trifle, scarcely worth mentioning. But if a great many other people, sharing the same mood, do likewise, then the evil grows and grows and the result is a great wrong, for which we are all responsible, and yet a wrong none of us intended or worked for or even imagined.

The failure of democracy provides a case in point. Whatever it may have meant in a small Greek city state, democracy in modern times means government by experts, instructed by the representatives of the people, in accordance with the general will. Thus democracy is open to failure at these three points. The experts may act as if the people existed for the governmental machine and not the governmental machine for the people. Again, the representatives of the people may be seduced by personal or financial interests or by the pressure of their party. Again, the people may be misled by propaganda or they may act blindly or unjustly through class or other prejudice. In short, for its satisfactory working, democracy requires at every stage persons with an informed and disinterested judgment, large conceptions of the common good and a vast amount of uprightness and public spirit. It is not too much to say that the failure of democracy can be traced to many small failures in a great many people; and yet the failure of democracy, through the increment of association, is a far more shocking thing than any of them expected, Every one has wanted democracy to function, but stronger than that desire has been the pull of personal interests and preoccupations, and so, without any great wrong having been intended, many great wrongs have been done, leading to the extinction of the very name of democracy over large parts of the earth.

Or consider the failures of the Church. Setting aside all merely frivolous complaints, one must admit that the Church has often failed, judged by almost any standard, let alone the highest. Yet this corporate failure can be resolved into a great many small instances of preoccupation, indifference, worldliness, and lack of consecration. Taken separately they do not seem serious, but the resultant failure is worse than any individual church member expects. No one willed the result, yet all are responsible, for behind it lies a deep inward identity of godless mood.

Thus both in Church and in State we have found the same thing, a vast corporate failure going back to a large number of individual failures, most of them trifling in themselves; yet through the increment of association the result is much more terrible than any one intended or imagined. Have we not here an aspect of the tragic mystery of evil?

Nevertheless this increment of association works not only for evil but also for good: indeed it works more wonderfully for good than for evil. There is a great promise in Leviticus—'And five of

you shall chase an hundred, and an hundred of you shall put ten thousand to flight.' Just as a mass of individual failures can work out a more dreadful failure than any one expected, so a mass of individual faithfulnesses can work out a more wonderful success than any one expected, and, since God is behind that mass of faithfulnesses, the success is out of strict proportion in its glory. 'An hundred shall put ten thousand to flight.' That is the increment of association for good.

So for us the important thing is that we recognize our individual responsibility for being attentive and obedient to God's call to us. The increment of association, whether for good or ill, only gets its chance on the basis of our decision and action. God can work our faithfulness in surprising fashion into His purposes, and perhaps in the end He can overrule our unfaithfulness, though we have no right to think of that beforehand. The responsibility in any case is ours to deal aright with His calls. We must not be too preoccupied to hear and obey.

There is one chief call of God which is suggested by the Parable. It speaks of discourteous people who miss the good things to which they are invited. May that not be the gospel call? God calls men to become His sons in Christ, heirs of God and joint-heirs with Christ. He calls us to the surrender and obedience of faith. He calls us to accept what He freely offers—forgiveness, cleansing, life eternal in Christ. Yes, and He calls us by name. For Him we are not lost in the crowd of invitations. If we are not there we shall be missed. How do we stand with reference to God's call to the marriage-supper of the Lamb? Is all God's bountiful provision to be useless so far as we are concerned, because we are too preoccupied with this world's affairs? That would be an insult and a grief to our Heavenly Father's heart. The responsibility is upon us each one individually. Here above all we are alone. No man can accept God's gift in Christ for another. Must it be set down that we began to make excuse? Or shall we be of those who make the great acceptance and taste even now of the life that is life indeed?

SEVENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Objective Christianity.

BY THE REVEREND JOHN L. RIACH, B.D., LARGS.

'Woman behold thy son!'—Jn 19^{26}.

Within the Church Hymnary there are two distinct types of hymns to be found. On the one hand, there are those which are subjective, where the author has his eye turned inward upon himself. An admirable illustration of this is to be found in Cowper's 'O for a closer walk with God.' On the other hand, there are those hymns which are objective, in which the writer rivets his attention on some being outside himself. Look at the fine example of that in Grant's glorious pæan of praise 'O worship the King.'

In exactly the same way there are two classes of individuals to be met with in this world. There are those who are subjective, whose interest is centred entirely upon themselves. Some are subjective politically, supporting this or that party, not because they believe it will benefit the nation as a whole, but simply because it will further their interests. Some are subjective socially. Let them enter into company and never once do they ask what contribution they can make to the evening's gaiety, but, focussing their eye upon themselves, they keep asking inwardly, 'What figure am I cutting here?' 'Am I impressing people?' In contrast to these mortals there are the objective souls of the world. Their interest is absorbed by things outside the self. A hobby, ideas, Nature, or music it may be which claims their whole attention.

The crucial question is, which of these two types does Christ call us to be as Christians? Peruse the Gospels, and there it is clear beyond a peradventure this exacting Master summons us to be not subjective but objective Christians. There are, alas, pious souls who are utterly subjective in their Christian Faith. What care they for the material and spiritual wellbeing of others? It is their own which concerns them. What thought have they for the salvation of others? Their own soul's salvation occupies all their attention. What ear have they for God's ideas of Himself and life? They are bound by their own erroneous conceptions spun out of their finite reason. What anxiety have they for the condition of other congregations? Let their own flourish and they are content.

Of course, all Christians must be subjective up to a point but to be totally subjective in these ways is wrong, palpably wrong. For, turn to the Gospels and the cry of Christ on every page is 'Resist the temptation to be subjective Christians and be objective. Turn your eyes not inward but outward on beings and things outside yourself.'

'Love thy neighbour as thyself' is the ringing call of the Gospels, meaning that we must not be subjective and care for our own wellbeing merely, but for the welfare of others, as Jesus did on that Cross when, seeing His widowed mother, He tore His gaze from His own awful plight, and nodding towards John said, 'Woman, behold thy son!' 'Go and preach the gospel to every creature' commands the Master, which signifies that we should not be subjective and be absorbed in the salvation of our own souls merely, but objective and concerned about the salvation of other men's souls. 'He that hath ears to hear, let him hear,' cries Christ, indicating that we must not be subjective and immersed in our own erroneous notions of God and life, but objective by listening to God's thoughts on these matters which He has revealed once and for all in Christ. 'Other sheep I have which are not of this fold,' pleads Christ, which is the call not to be subjective and toil for the wellbeing of our own congregation only, but to be objective by work and prayer for the whole Church.

To be objective not subjective Christians is the unmistakable call of Christ in the Gospels to us one and all.

1. If we pay heed to this cry, and obey, two results will follow for us. The one is that our Christian Faith will bring us happiness.

It was Robert Louis Stevenson who once ventured the oft misunderstood remark: 'We quest for happiness but are not meant to find it.' The Edinburgh genius did not mean that God grudges us every bit of happiness which comes our way. He was indicating that happiness eludes you if you go in direct pursuit of it. The fact is that happiness, like many other covetable things, such as charm or dignity, is not captured directly but indirectly. It comes unconsciously as the by-product of being objective.

This is the conclusion arrived at by that influential modern, Professor Joad. He claims to have been a happy man and he asserts it is due to the fact that he is an objective person, being interested in things outside himself such as Nature, music, and food. It is little wonder, therefore, that he offers this counsel: 'Seek happiness and it will elude you. Lift yourself outside the pit of self by giving yourself to something greater than self, and you will find that you have been happy.'

Many an untruth has been uttered in the interests of the gospel. Not a few evangelists in their earnest passion for souls have said that if once a man embrace the Christian faith he will, as a natural result, be happy. That, certainly, should be the case, for were not Jesus and His followers likened to a band of gay wedding guests? Yet the fact remains that Christianity does not make some of its professed devotees happy but morbid, sad and gloomy. And is not the reason for this perverted result in such unfortunates that they are totally subjective instead of objective Christians? For happiness is the by-product of being objective.

2. The other result which will follow if we really respond to Christ's call to be objective Christians is that we will then truly worship God.

What is the primary object of church going? It is not as Emerson once nobly said to see how it stands with us. It is to worship God. Yes, but what exactly does it mean to worship? Dr. Gossip records that when minister of Beechgrove he had an exceptional worshipper in the late Dr. Hastings. As the scripture was being read he listened with awe as if he had never heard such great tidings before, and during the sermon he drank in every word with obvious gratitude. That is what it means to worship God. It is to be oblivious of everything but Him or, as Wesley has put it, to be lost in wonder, love and praise of Him.

But how, pray, can any subjective Christian do that? It is an utter impossibility. So full of self is he that he cannot forget self and be conscious only of God. It is little wonder that Whyte of St. George's once said of a certain congregation to which he preached, that they were so cold in their worship that he could not get the chill out of his bones even two years after the experience. It is possible to be a loyal churchman and a bad worshipper. A man may enter the House of God merely to get. He may go on the outlook for enjoyment, or comfort, or the corroboration of his own opinions. Thus, totally subjective, such a person cannot lose himself in the worship of God. Only the objective souls of the world are capable of such a lofty, self-forgetting act.

Spenser's *Fairie Queene* suffers from two defects, aver the critics. It is too intricate and over-elaborated in theme. And the cause of these flaws which marred a great work was that the poet was too subjective. How many Christian folk there are whose piety and earnestness is beyond dispute but who suffer from two defects. Their faith has not brought happiness in its train, nor do they ever worship God with the intensity that is His due, all for the reason that they have never risen from self-centred subjective Christianity to the objective Faith to which Christ calls them.

EIGHTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Walking Worthily of God.

'How men ought to behave themselves in the house of God, which is the church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth.'—1 Ti 3^{15} (R.V.).

How to behave oneself, how to meet the claims of life in a Christian fashion, in Paul's phrase how to walk worthily of God—that is a theme which engages a large part of the New Testament. We have been engaged in the sacrament of Holy Communion, and marvellous and surpassing things have been thrust upon our sense: is this to be without effect? Every Sacrament and indeed every act of Christian worship ought to have a sequel, and a man returning to his common tasks ought to feel—I have seen what must make my whole life different. The Apostle, who was never afraid of homeliness in his moral teaching, had touched in this chapter on such plain domestic matters as quarrelling and gossip and conceit, the care of children and the love of money, things which can only seem trivial to a Christian man, if he forgets that God sees him and that men, who also see him, are making inferences from his behaviour as to what Christ is worth. It is of these two encouragements to care in the management of life that we will speak.

1. How ought we to behave seeing that this is the Church of a God who is alive? In Paul's view this made all the difference.

The sense of God as living bears directly upon our worship, making every act of devotion serious and real, and it is for lack of this that many of us fail. In His picture of the Last Judgment Jesus introduces people who protested that they had heard Him preaching in their streets, and yet of them He declares, 'I know you not whence you are.' It would appear that though they had heard, somehow they had not heard *Him*, for that is a revolutionary experience. Going further, they protested that they had eaten and drunk in His presence, sitting at His Table; but in fact, for them, Christ was not discernibly there. There is a pretentious picture from last century of Joshua bidding the sun stand still, which Charles

Lamb assailed with the terrible criticism that he could hardly make Joshua out amid the mob of elaborately painted warriors.

When a man says, 'I have eaten and drunk in Christ's presence,' the question arises—Were you more conscious of Him or of your neighbours?—was it a bigger thing in your feeling that He was present than that others were? For when He comes He can change water into wine, and can so multiply the provision that the crumb of bread becomes a benefaction, and everything grows real and miraculous and deep. This sense of His living activity is the determining element in every Communion. For here in our service we have not a cut flower, the faded reminder of that which once was: the sap of life is in it still. It is not primarily a reverent act of ours but an act of His, it is 'the going on of the three-and-thirty years.'

There are hosts of people to-day worshipping rather in the Church of their devout fathers than in the Church of a living God, and they are content to love God with their fathers' hearts more than with their own. Such an attitude is worthy of respect, but it is based upon a relation to God which is at second-hand, whereas the true faith is a man's own response to One who is living and near, who pleads for us and pleads with us. This defect appears most clearly in the welcome given by these loyalists to the great affirmations of the Faith about atonement and conversion and pardon, for to them these are merely orthodox and accepted words. But since the Lord is alive and doing something they ought to be the records of experiences renewed in each new generation. God does not bring all His sons to Himself by the same road, so their personal reports are bound to vary, but there are people who can never forget the day when from Him they first received His loving sentence of pardon. As Bunyan describes it, the burden was loosed from their shoulders and fell away, and they now could go with free feet. In the Church of a living God it is not words which count but the power of words; and whoever knows nothing of this may know God as a name or rumour, he does not know Him as He truly is—'the great God and our Saviour.'

Worship is thus directly involved, but in Paul's view conduct is even more affected by the thought of God as alive. It exasperated him to see so many people in the Church carrying on their daily life on the basis of what he scornfully calls 'eye-service,' such service as might pass with an unobservant employer. Nothing on the surface may be glaringly amiss, but if our Master is alive He must be as searchingly present in the shop or office as in the Temple, and from His scrutiny of our common work there can be no escape. In writing to slaves Paul bids them do everything 'as to the Lord and not to men at all.'

It would be unfortunate if we thought of this divine activity and scrutiny merely as designed to catch us out in fault: of our Lord Jesus it is said that 'He ever liveth to make intercession for us,' and thus bring victory within our reach. It is easy sometimes to indulge good thoughts and resolutions in church, where all things speak of God's glory, but outside, where nothing speaks of God, He is not less urgently present. As He knows how hard it is to keep ourselves unspotted, He does not leave us out of reach of His help; the trouble is that we so often reckon not with the terms of His directions but with our sense of what we are fit for and of how far we may safely go. In the tormented days of the Covenanters in Scotland, one of their preachers in a sermon narrated from the Church's long story one feat after another of brave performance, and to each instance he added as refrain, 'They sought no more than His commandment, they went and He carried them well through.' That is the secret of triumphant living—obedience on our side and activity on His.

2. But now of Paul's other motive for care in the management of life. Life, he maintains, would be more carefully handled if we always remembered that God sees us, but he adds—if we remembered that men also see. 'The Church,' he says, 'is the pillar and the support of the Truth': if it is true to its calling it makes the Truth conspicuous and it makes it credible. On the other hand we have sadly to confess that a Church which is morally degraded may make the Truth incredible. In a daring image Paul speaks of the Church as 'the Body of Christ.' The body is a slow and imperfect indication of the spirit's movement, but it is the only indication we possess. So, in Paul's view, the Church is the appointed instrument of the mind and heart of Jesus: it exists to represent Him to men, and to testify to a scheme of things which He has purposed.

We need not imagine that His purpose of mercy is absolutely limited by the selfishness and sluggishness of the Church, for He said that 'God is able of these stones to raise up children to Abraham.' God has strange ways of getting at the hearts of His creatures, in which the Church has little direct or obvious part: in the chambers of memory, out of a long-forgotten childhood, a word awakens, and, without any human intervention, the heart is won for nobler ways. God is not limited by our conscious effort and planning; yet in the main it is true that on us Church members there rests the burden of helping other men to believe. If we are worldly, craven, ungenial, we need not expect that the multiplication of brighter preachers will save the situation, for a Church demoralized bears witness, far beyond the power of preaching, that the Truth which it proclaims is of little worth. Wherever it is suspected that prominent churchmen accept a standard of commercial integrity lower than others, when they are bad masters or bad landlords they make their Church to be not the pillar but the pillory of the Truth. If our Master has made it possible for us to '*adorn* the doctrine of our God and Saviour,' we must at least see to it that we do not disgrace that doctrine.

What is this Truth which the Church exists to proclaim, and which, by our lives, we may make more credible to men? In the forefront is the majestic assertion that 'God so loved the world

as to give His Only Son '—an assertion familiar to the ear, but not easy of acceptance, for the world has so little the look of divine love on its face that by many the message is rejected as an idle tune of words. So the word must still be in flesh, the divine assertion must be translated into deeds of kindness, of patience unwearying and hope which refuses to be baffled. We affirm in our Faith that Christ actually died for men that they might not perish, and we affirm that God 'willeth that all men should be saved'; but if such affirmations are sincerely made by us we surely ought to bestir ourselves in letting men know what God's desire for them is. Paul speaks lovingly of the incapable man who, by his recklessness, seems to tempt the Devil; he calls him —'that weak man, your brother, for whom Christ died'; but his compassion did not exhaust itself in words, it ran out in manifold activities. And if, like Paul, we could translate our faith into works, bearing all things and hoping all things, and never failing, then the Church would indeed be the pillar of the Truth, making it conspicuous and challenging in the eyes of all men.[1]

[1] W. M. Macgregor, *Christ and the Church*, 188.

The Covenant of People.

By the Reverend Matthew Black, Ph.D., D.Litt., Dunbarney, Perth.

The institution of Covenant is one of the unique contributions of Israel to religious history. Its main features are familiar: certain religious obligations (always with a strong ethical bias) become binding on the people, while God solemnly undertakes to do something for them. The societary idea is predominant: the terms of the Covenant were binding on the individual Israelite, but only as a member of the Covenant-community. In most of the ancient Covenants an inaugural solemnization was accompanied by a sacrifice of ratification involving the manipulation of dedicated blood.

In prophetic thought two conceptions of Covenant are outstanding: they are those of Jeremiah and of the Second Isaiah.

All the essential features of Covenant are present in Jeremiah's prophetic vision (31^{31}). What is revolutionary in his thought is the removal of religious obligation from the sphere of external law and enforced obedience to that of the mind and conscience of the individual. The societary idea is still dominant; the New Covenant is to be with a united Israel. But there is a new insistence on individual responsibility, inward obedience to the divine revelation, and personal fellowship with God. The divine undertaking is explicit: it is to consist of an amnesty for the past, the remission of sins for ever, and a renewal of the ancient Covenant Promise, 'I will be their God, and they shall be my people.'

An important development occurs in Deutero-Isaiah. The Covenant institution is denationalized; God's chosen people, the new people of His gathering, may be drawn from any and every nation (56^{1-8}). Such an extension of the Covenant was a necessary corollary of the Second Isaiah's universalism: the God of Israel was the true God, the God of all the earth (45^{22}). But the Covenant is to be given to the world by Israel, in whom alone reposes the knowledge of the true God, or rather—and here the Second Isaiah develops His unique Covenant conception—it is to be mediated to all, within Israel or without, by her ideal representative, the Servant of the Lord (49^{6}). Moreover, it is He Himself, the great Servant, who is to become 'a Covenant of People' (49^{8}, 42^{6}): a Covenant Person, that is to say, in whom is epitomized the true Israel, is to constitute a personal Bond between God and the new people of His choice, one in whom the full obligations of man's life to God shall be patent to the world ('a light to the nations'). The Covenant so struck shall be one of everlasting mercy and peace (54^{10}); and God Himself undertakes that the spirit He shall put upon His Servant and the words given Him to utter shall endure for ever (59^{21}).

The final stage in the development is in the New Testament.

There appears to be general agreement that Mk 14^{24}, 'This is my blood of the covenant,' contains an allusion to the ratification of a Covenant by a sacrificial ceremony, and the same idea may also be present in the parallel saying at the breaking of the bread.[1]

But was the Covenant which was so ratified the New Covenant of Jeremiah? The Pauline form of the words has led most exegetes to assume that it was, and the Epistle to the Hebrews explicitly relates the sacrifice of Christ to Jeremiah's New Covenant (8^{8-12} 10^{15-18}). But the omission of the adjective 'New' in Mk 14^{24} is significant. It would be rash to infer that there was no allusion at all in this pregnant Word to the great prophetic conception of Jeremiah. But at the same time,

[1] Hans Lietzmann, *Messe und Herrenmahl*, 221.

we would do less than justice to the range of our Lord's thought if we exclude all reference to the Covenant conception of the Second Isaiah. The latter represents a high-water mark of prophetic thought, including all that is great in the vision of the seventh century prophet, yet excluding by transcending its purely nationalistic limitations.

All the essential elements in a spiritual Covenant Institution are contained in the conception of 'Christ our Covenant.' The societary idea is prominent both in Isaiah and in the mind of Jesus; according to St. Luke, Jesus declared after the Supper to His disciples, the nucleus of the new people, 'I covenant (διατίθεμαι) to you a kingdom . . .' (22[29]).[1] No nobler expression can be found for the sum of all man's obligations to God than that 'this mind be in us which was also in Christ'; Thomas Chalmers declared that 'the only effective way of preaching morality in all its branches was to preach Christ.' And there can be no greater demonstration of God's everlasting mercy than that He gave His Anointed to sufferings and death for 'a Covenant of People.'

This interpretation of Mk 14[24] has one further advantage: it gives full meaning to the act of partaking of the bread and wine.

In his well-known exposition of this verse, Hans Lietzmann, who regards both the bread and wine as symbolizing a sacrifice ratifying the New Covenant of Jeremiah, remarks: 'A problem by itself is the question, How Jesus in such a connexion can equate the bread with His body, the wine with His blood: where lies the *tertium comparationis*? It was early said: the breaking of the bread in pieces is a picture of the dismembered body of the sacrificial animal. That is clear; but it is difficult to find an analogous point of comparison with the wine. True, it is "poured out" from the pitcher into the flagon, out of the flagon into the throat—but every one must feel that this picture is less obvious: the filling up from the pitcher in all probability took place before Jesus spoke, and the pouring into the throats of the participants one can only with great difficulty see as a picture of blood streaming out of the wound.'[2]

But Christ, 'the Covenant of People,' the living personal bond between man and God, was present at the Table, and in inviting His disciples, the new people of God, to partake of the bread and the wine as the symbols of His surrendered life, He is inviting them to share in His Covenant-life and be united through Him to God.[3]

It is to a Word of the Fourth Gospel we must go for the interpretation of Mk 14[24]: 'Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you.[4] . . . He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him. As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father: so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me.'[5]

The Father communicates His life to the Son, and the Son to the believer. Christ is the living bond between God and man. And the life of the Son of man which He communicates is His Covenant-life—the mind and character in man desired by God. In entering into that mind so that such a character is formed in us, we are included in the Covenant of People.

[1] Cf. R. Otto, *The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man*, Eng. ed., 268.

[2] *Op. cit.*, 221 (translation mine). Such distressing attempts to make clear the symbolism of the Supper are themselves evidence that exegesis has somewhere taken a false turning.

[3] B. F. Westcott (*The Epistles of St. John*, 34 f., *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, 293 f.), insisted on the interpretation of the blood of Christ as a symbol of His life preserved and active beyond death. But in placing Mk 14[24] alongside He 9[15] (the blood of the New Covenant) he is compelled to interpret, 'By "sprinkling" of Christ's Blood the believer is first brought into fellowship with God in Christ; and in the imperfect conduct of his personal life, the life of Christ is continually communicated to him for growth and cleansing' (*The Epistles of St. John*, 36). But growth is not communicated by 'sprinkling'; it comes from partaking of the right food and drink.

[4] The idea is even more primitive than that of a sacrifice for ratification or a piaculum; cf. W. Robertson Smith, *The Religion of the Semites*, 345. But that does not mean that it is not capable of expressing a spiritual truth of the deepest meaning.

[5] These words, with many another Saying in John, may be genuine, and I am fully convinced they are.

Contributions and Comments.

The Presbyter John.

THE words ὁ πρεσβύτερος Ἰωάννης in the famous fragment of Papias have most commonly been taken to mean 'John the Presbyter as distinct from John the Apostle.' So many authorities have accepted this view that it seems rash to question it on linguistic grounds; but, if πρεσβύτερος is a distinguishing title, I do not understand why it is placed in an unemphatic position between ὁ and Ἰωάννης. Papias might surely have been expected to write Ἰωάννης ὁ πρεσβύτερος. We speak of *Dumas père*, not *le père Dumas*

(which would suggest that Dumas was a monk or a Jesuit); and I cannot think that Greek idiom is different in this respect.

If, on the other hand, *πρεσβύτερος* is unemphatic, it cannot have changed its meaning since its last occurrence, only two or three lines earlier, where it was a synonym for apostle. John the Presbyter must therefore be identified with John the Apostle. There is the objection that John the Apostle is now mentioned twice in Papias' list; but this could have happened through inadvertence. (Haussleiter and Blass thought that the previous reference to John was an interpolation. See the linguistic reasons in Blass, *Philology of the Gospels*, 222 f.)

This conclusion, if correct, would of course be fatal to Streeter's theory about the authorship of the Fourth Gospel, but, as Haussleiter pointed out, it would explain one rather curious fact. Dionysius of Alexandria wanted to transfer the Apocalypse from John the Apostle to some other John. Now, if he had known of Streeter's Presbyter, he would almost certainly have seized on him as the ideal choice. Yet, strange to say, he ignores him, and is content with the vague remark that there were many Johns in Ephesus.

G. M. Lee.

Bedford.

Matthew vi. 13 = Luke xi. 4; cf. Mark xiv. 38.

Μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν. These words, as usually translated, appear to be countered by a passage in Ja 1^{13}; and it may be suspected that, when spoken in Aramaic by Jesus, they bore a different meaning. We find in Cyprian (*de domin. orat.* 7) this rendering: 'ne *patiaris* nos induci'; *suffer* us not to be brought into temptation (or less likely, 'trial,' *i.e.* the fiery persecution that heralds the End). Does not this give the sense required?

E. H. Blakeney.

Winchester.

Entre Nous.

Dr. J. H. Hertz.

With the passing of Dr. J. H. Hertz the Jews of this country, and, indeed, all Jewry, has lost a notable figure. He stood out in the minds of many as a third in the group of significant figures of which the other two were Archbishop Temple and Cardinal Hinsley. Like them he represented in a peculiar fashion one of the three great religious communities of the land; like them he was a man of high courage, strong principle and utter devotion to the faith he professed. All three were outspoken in their claims for righteousness, national and international, and it may be said of each that he was an example of all that was best in his own communion. The late Chief Rabbi was an orthodox Jew, and would make no compromise on what he regarded as the essentials of his national religion; he dealt as faithfully with weaknesses in his own community as with the sins of the outer world. He was, also, a fine scholar, though his manifold interests left him little time for abstruse study or extensive literary work. He is best known to Christian readers through his editions of the Pentateuch and the Jewish Prayer Book. These were published in Hebrew, with an English translation on the opposite page, and notes in the margin. The latter were never elaborate, and were aimed simply at making clear the sense of obscure passages. Those printed with the Prayer Book were especially valuable, and helped not a few readers to get to the heart of the Jewish faith. In this respect they were, probably, as valuable to the non-Jew as to the Jew, and he was fortunate in seeing the last volume issued before he died. We shall all miss him; a great figure has been taken from our world.

T. H. Robinson.

Professor Joad's Conversion.

This is the title of a note in *The Modern Churchman* which summarises an article in 'The Rationalist Annual' of December last by Dr. Joad. The title of the article is 'On Being no longer a Rationalist,' and it gives Dr. Joad's reasons for abandoning his rationalist attitude towards religion. Dr. Joad is so well known that his change of attitude is of particular interest.

For many years Dr. Joad has not believed in a Personal God. But he was neither a materialist nor a determinist. He believed in freewill and also in spiritual values like truth and beauty. So far as his metaphysical outlook was concerned he believed (like Shaw) in a Life Force. Experience of life, however, seemed to him to reveal three weaknesses in his philosophy. First, the moral life it inspired was not of the highest order. It was utilitarian and self-regarding. Secondly, this philosophy failed to satisfy him rationally. The third weakness was revealed by the dark side of the Second World War. In other words he could not help facing the fact of sin and the helplessness of his philosophy to afford a radical cure. And as a consequence of his changed estimate of human nature Dr. Joad was converted to a belief in the need for Divine Grace, without which man could not achieve salvation. This conviction led him to entertain the hope and faith that a Personal God can and will supply such grace if humbly sought and thankfully received.

In The Expository Times of July, 1943, we drew attention to a remarkable statement by Dr. Joad on his spiritual development in the preface to a new edition of his Correspondence with Arnold Lunn. At that time he had come to the conclusion that evil in man was not due to bad

social conditions but to *sin*. It is revealing and heartening to find that he has gone a big step forward and discovered *grace*. It is encouraging to people who are not so clever as Dr. Joad to see a man of his philosophical acumen reaching out to what is the heart of the gospel under the teaching of sheer experimental fact.

F. J. Rae.

Elizabeth Pilenko : A Russian Saint.

In *The Christian News-Letter* for 17th April, 1946, Kathleen Bliss tells the story of Elizabeth Pilenko.

'Most of us begin to understand the power of the risen Christ only when we see it at work in men and women. There are many unwritten lives of the saints, and this war has added to their number.

'Elizabeth Pilenko came from a wealthy land-owning family in the south of Russia. She went to the Women's University of St. Petersburg. . . . She became Mayor of her own home town, working for justice between the Whites and the Reds. . . . In 1923 she came to Paris. The excesses of the Revolution as it developed revolted her, though she remained to her death a staunch advocate of its principles. She found her way back to religious faith largely under the influence of Serge Bulgakov, who had been a Marxist. She presented herself to the authorities of the Russian Church in Paris and announced that she wished to become a religious, "beginning at once, to-day," and to found a monastery. She had her way, but she was not the traditional Russian Orthodox religious. She was accused by some of neglecting the long services and the traditional contemplation. "I must go my way," she said, "I am for the suffering people." In the early morning she was at the markets buying cheap food for the people she fed, bringing it back in a sack on her back. She was a familiar figure in the slum, in her poor black habit and her worn-out men's shoes.

'The many Russian refugees in France in those days were stateless persons, many of them poverty-stricken, without privilege, without claim on any of the services which the country provided for the poor. Mother Maria worked among the poorest. She discovered that Russians who contracted tuberculosis were lying in a filthy hovel on the banks of the Seine into which the Paris police used to throw those syphilitic wrecks which they picked up along the riverside. With ten francs in her pocket she bought a château and opened a sanatorium.

'When the German occupation took place Mother Maria summoned her chaplain and told him that she felt that her particular duty was to render all possible assistance to persecuted Jews. She knew that this would mean imprisonment and probably death, and she gave him the option of leaving. He refused. For a month the convent was a haven for Jews. Women and children were hidden within its walls. Money poured in to enable them to escape from France and hundreds were got away. At the end of a month the Gestapo came. Mother Maria was arrested and sent to the concentration camp at Ravensbrueck. Her chaplain was sent to Buchenwald, where he died of starvation and overwork. The story of her life in the camp is only now being pieced together. She was known even to the guards as "that wonderful Russian nun," and it is doubtful whether they had any intention of killing her. She had been there two and a half years when a new block of buildings was erected in the camp, and the prisoners were told that these were to be hot baths. A day came when a few dozen prisoners from the women's quarters were lined up outside the buildings. One girl became hysterical. Mother Maria, who had not been selected, came up to her, "Don't be frightened," she said, "look, I shall take your turn," and in line with the rest she passed through the doors. It was Good Friday, 1945.'

One of the Four Freedoms.

Dr. Frank N. Buchman, leader of the Oxford Group Movement, is now in this country. On 2nd May Mr. Driberg, a Labour M.P., asked the Home Secretary 'why Dr. Buchman, a United States evangelist, who formerly expressed enthusiasm for the work and personalities of the Nazi leaders, had been permitted to enter this country, together with a team of about one hundred of his followers, for the purpose of disseminating the propaganda of his cult; whether they would be permitted to engage in gainful employment while in this country, and how long they were to be allowed to stay.'

Mr. Chuter Ede replied: 'It is not the policy of H.M. Government to discriminate between religious bodies [Cheers], and this evangelist has a number of adherents in this country whose loyalty has never been in doubt, whatever his personal political views may have been in the past.'

To a further question the Home Secretary replied: 'I am not prepared to inquire into the characters of people who desire to give expression to religious views in this country. I know from representations that have been made to me by members of this House that certain of them have gained spiritual strength and consolation from this denomination. I have not had that experience myself; but, in a great phrase, "the wind bloweth where it listeth." I am not prepared to put any obstruction in the way' [Cheers].

So once more the cause of one of the Four Freedoms has been vindicated in the British House of Commons.

Printed in Scotland by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.